DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 869 AL 002 603

AUTHOR Levy, Mary M.; Griffith, Belver C.
TITLE Information Flow in the Language Sciences: An Exploratory Case Study of the Washington, D.C. Area. LINCS Project Document Series.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C. Language Information Network and Clearinghouse System.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. Office of Economic and Manpower Studies.
REPORT NO LINCS-12-69
PUB DATE Dec 69
NOTE 109p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.55
DESCRIPTORS *Information Dissemination, Interviews, *Linguistics, *Occupational Surveys, Periodicals, *Professional Personnel, Questionnaires, Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

This report is a case study of communication in the language sciences in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. The areas of investigation were: (1) the professional characteristics of the people working in the language sciences, their major fields, academic background, and professional activities; (2) the types of information desired by language professionals, the sources consulted, the problems encountered in obtaining needed information, and the role of the various channels of information in the processing of information exchange; (3) the relationship among different areas in the language sciences in terms of the flow of information and overlap of subject-matter interests. The two principal components of the study were a questionnaire survey designed to obtain general data on the community of language professionals, and a series of interviews designed to explore the individual's use of information in his work setting. For the purposes of the study subjects were divided by major field into linguists, foreign language specialists, and professionals in other fields, and results revealed that respondents from these three different groups have different patterns of professional characteristics and activities. Much of the information obtained from the study is displayed in tabular form. The questionnaire form and the interview schedule are appended. (Author/FWB)

ED043869

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

LANGUAGE INFORMATION NETWORK AND CLEARINGHOUSE SYSTEM (LINCS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INFORMATION FLOW IN THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES: AN EXPLORATORY CASE STUDY OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C. AREA

By Mary M. Levy
with the assistance of
Belver C. Griffith

AL 002 603

LINCS PROJECT DOCUMENT SERIES / NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION GRANT

LINCS #12-69 December 1969 NSF GN-771

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

ED0 43869

INFORMATION FLOW IN THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES: AN EXPLORATORY CASE STUDY OF THE WASHINGTON, D.C. AREA

By Mary M. Levy
with the assistance of
Belver C. Griffith

CONTENTS

List of Tables iii
Abstract 1
1. Introduction 8
2. Method 11
3. Professional Background and Work Activities of Language Professionals 13
3.1. Linguists 13
3.1.1. Degree Level 13
3.1.2. Degree Major 13
3.1.3. Place of Employment 14
3.1.4. Work Activity 15
3.2. Foreign Language Specialists 17
3.2.1. Language Field 17
3.2.2. Degree Level 18
3.2.3. Degree Major 19
3.2.4. Place of Employment 20
3.2.5. Work Activity 20
3.3. Professionals in Other Fields 21
3.3.1. Degree Level 22
3.3.2. Degree Major 23
3.3.3. Place of Employment 23
3.3.4. Work Activity 24
3.4. Specialization in Exotic as Opposed to Commonly Taught Foreign Languages 25
3.4.1. Professional Identification 25
3.4.2. Degree Level 26
3.4.3. Degree Major 26
3.4.4. Place of Employment 26
3.4.5. Work Activity 27
4. The Relative Importance and Role of Various Sources of Information 28
5. Society Membership and Meeting Attendance and the Use of Published Sources and Informal Contacts 33
5.1. Linguists 33
5.1.1. Society Membership and Meeting Attendance 33
5.1.2. Published Sources 36
5.1.3. Informal Contacts 37
5.2. Foreign Language Specialists 38
5.2.1. Society Membership and Meeting Attendance 38
5.2.2. Published Sources 39
5.2.3. Informal Contacts 40
5.3. Professionals in Other Fields 41
5.3.1 Society Membership and Meeting Attendance 41
5.3.2. Published Sources 42
5.3.3. Informal Contacts 43
6. Information Flow and Problems in the Context of Scientific and Professional Work 45
6.1. Linguists 45

6.1.1. Managerial Linguists 45
6.1.2. Active Linguists 46
6.1.3. Researchers in Esoteric Areas 48
6.1.4. Isolated Researchers 49
6.2. Language Teachers 51
6.2.1. Language School Teachers 55
6.2.2. University Language Teachers 57
6.2.3. Public School Language Teachers 58
6.3. Researchers in Other Fields 59
6.3.1. Speech 59
6.3.2. Psychology 60
6.3.3. Mathematics 60
6.4. Specialists in the Exotic Languages 61
6.5. Informal Communication 63
7. The Reaction to and Use of Some Specialized Information Services and Media 68
7.1. Technical Reports 68
7.2. Educational Resources Information Center of the United States Office of Education (ERIC) 70
7.3. Abstracts 72
7.4. Bibliographies 73
7.5. Libraries 74
7.6. Ads and Catalogs 75
8. Cross-Disciplinary Interests of Language Professionals 76
8.1. Linguists 76
8.2. Foreign Language Specialists 78
8.3. Professionals in Other Fields 80
9. Reactions in Other Disciplines to Linguistics 83
9.1. Language Teachers 83
9.2. Language Scholars 86
9.3. Researchers in Other Fields 87
References 88
Appendix A 90
Appendix B 94
Appendix C 97
Appendix D 99

LIST OF TABLES

1. Number of Linguists by Major Subject of Highest Degree 14
2. Number of Linguists by Type of Employer 15
3. Number of Linguists by Primary and Secondary Work Activity 15
4. Number of Linguists by Work Activity and Type of Employer 16
5. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Language 18
6. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Major Subject of Highest Degree 19
7. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Type of Employer 20
8. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Primary and Secondary Work Activity 20
9. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Work Activity and Type of Employer 21
10. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Field of Specialization 22
11. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Major Subject of Highest Degree and Present Field of Specialization 23
12. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Type of Employer 23
13. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Primary and Secondary Work Activity 24
14. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Work Activity and Type of Employer 24
15. Number of Respondents by Professional Category Rating Each Information Source "Very Important" 28
16. Number of Respondents by Professional Category Indicating Secondary Information Sources Used 30
17. Number of Respondents by Professional Category Indicating Most Helpful Secondary Information Source Used 31
18. Number of Linguists by Type of Professional Society Affiliation 33
19. Number of Linguists by Type of Professional Convention/ Conference Attended in Previous Year 35
20. Number of Linguists by Major Subject Area of Journals Scanned or Read 36
21. Number of Linguists by Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts 37
22. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Type of Professional Society Affiliation 38
23. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Type of Professional Convention/Conference Attended in Previous Year 39
24. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Major Subject Area of Journals Scanned or Read 40
25. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts 41
26. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Type of Extradisciplinary Professional Society Affiliation 41

27. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Type of Professional Convention/Conference Attended in Previous Year 42
28. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Major Subject Area (Other than Field of Specialization) of Journals Scanned or Read 43
29. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts 44
30. Number of Linguists by Special Interest Types 77
31. Number of Linguists by Fields Rated Important Sources of Information 77
32. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Special Interest Types 79
33. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Fields Rated Important Sources of Information 79
34. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Special Interest Types 81

Abstract

This exploratory case study of the language sciences in Washington, D.C. concentrated on the self-identification, training, interests, and information needs and behavior of the extremely heterogeneous group of people who work with language professionally, referred to here as language professionals. The two principal components of the study were a questionnaire survey designed to obtain general data on the community of professionals, and a series of interviews designed to explore the individual's use of information in his work setting. For most purposes, subjects were divided by major field into linguists, foreign language specialists, and professionals in other fields. For other purposes, work activity was also considered and the foreign language specialists were subdivided into language teachers and language scholars. When language specialization was the focus of attention, respondents specializing in exotic languages, regardless of discipline, were found to form one group and those in the commonly taught foreign languages (French, Spanish, and German), again regardless of discipline, were found to form another.

Of 161 questionnaire respondents, 62 were linguists, 61 foreign language specialists, and 38 professionals in other fields; 36 specialized in the commonly taught languages and 14 in the exotic. Of 70 persons interviewed, 26 were linguists, 23 foreign language specialists, and 21 specialists in other fields. When work activity was considered, 26 were classified as linguists, 7 as language scholars, 19 as language teachers, and 14 as researchers in other fields, 4 did not fit into any of these categories. They were systematically selected to reflect a wide range of work settings and disciplines. Six worked chiefly in the commonly taught languages and 12 in the exotic languages.

When respondents were subdivided according to major field, into linguists, foreign language specialists, and professionals in other fields, the three groups revealed different patterns of professional characteristics and activities.

1) A majority of linguists in the questionnaire sample were Ph.D.'s or Ph.D. candidates, while the rest were at or near the master's level. Most had majored in linguistics, and many had training in and worked on particular foreign languages, including English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). Most worked at universities, federal government agencies, or the Center for Applied Linguistics. A few were employed at smaller colleges and commercial language schools; none taught in the secondary schools. Their principal professional activities were teaching and research in that order

(although if dissertation and foreign language text preparation were classified as research, research would be the more important activity for some). As a group the linguists were relatively recent graduates in that almost half had received their highest degree within the last five years and almost all within the last fifteen.

2) A little over half of the foreign language specialists in the questionnaire sample worked in the commonly taught languages; the rest were divided fairly evenly among the remaining categories: ESOL, other European, classical, and exotic. (See table 5, page 18.) Equal numbers were at or near the master's and Ph.D. levels. Most had majored in foreign languages, very few in linguistics or other subjects. As a group they seemed to be older than the linguists: almost half had been awarded their highest degree more than ten or fifteen years ago, while fewer than one-third had received it in the last five years. They held positions at a far wider range of institutions than did the linguists, including public schools, colleges, and commercial language schools, as well as universities and federal government agencies. Teaching was by far their most prominent work activity;other activities, including research, were reported to be much less important. (In this connection it is interesting to note that many linguists interviewed considered teaching a side activity even when it consumed the better part of their time. For many of the foreign language specialists, however, especially those in the commonly taught languages, teaching was of primary importance and other activities, such as text preparation or even research, were supportive of their teaching rather than ends in themselves.)

3) Few specialists in other fields were found to be engaged in language sciences at any one local institution or in any one field other than education. Those sampled were diverse in major field, academic training, work activities, and place of employment. Most had been trained in their field of current major interest; few had majored in any subject in the language sciences. Apart from teachers and administrators in English, speech, and reading, who were affiliated with colleges and secondary schools as well as universities,most of the professionals surveyed in other fields were in universities or the federal government, or more infrequently, in private research and consulting institutions. University faculty members in this group, like the linguists, were engaged primarily in teaching and research: those with the government carried on a variety of activities.

Differences in professional characteristics and activities were also associated with the nature of the language with which the respondents were concerned.

1) Of those sampled whose principal work was in the exotic languages (see text for definition), a slight majority identified themselves as linguists and most of the remainder as foreign language specialists. Almost all were at or near the doctoral level: all of the linguists and several non-linguists had majored in linguistics, the rest in their language of specialization. Their principal places of employment were universities and federal government agencies; their principal work activities were teaching and research, the latter being fairly important.

2) Among respondents in the commonly taught languages almost none were linguists; the great majority were language teachers at the M.A. level who had majored in a foreign language. Almost all worked in educational institutions: universities, colleges, public schools, commercial language schools, and private schools. Research was relatively unimportant as a work activity.

Asked about the importance of various media of communication, over two-thirds of the questionnaire respondents in each group -- linguists, foreign language specialists, and professionals in other fields -- rated books and journals as an important source of professional information. Between one-third and one-half rated immediate colleagues as important. All other sources were rated as important by fewer than one-third of the linguists and foreign language specialists and fewer than one-half of the specialists in other fields. Over three-fourths of the questionnaire respondents in all three groups reported regular scanning of periodical literature, asking colleagues, and citations in books and articles as secondary sources they used; the same three sources were most frequently rated most helpful. The interview data underlined the importance of colleagues as a secondary source, particularly when published sources were inadequate.

For interview subjects the two most important primary sources of information were colleagues and published documents, mainly books and journals. The role played by each differed in accordance with the professional identity and work activities of the information seeker. Linguists, most of whom engaged in research of some kind, and researchers in other fields found published documents most useful for theoretical information, grammatical analysis of specific languages, answers to general reference questions, and past findings in a subject. Journals were important in keeping up with current developments. Both groups relied upon colleagues for advice and comment on their own work, news on research in progress, references to the literature of their field or specialty, and many types of information in areas not their own; colleagues were also described as helpful in providing current awareness.

For the foreign language specialists, most of them teachers, books and journals were sources of information on general teaching techniques; books also provided grammatical and other reference information. Colleagues supplied ideas on teaching techniques, both general and specific, and some grammatical information about a particular language. Both written sources and colleagues were important for current developments, such as new trends in teaching methodology and new texts and teaching materials.

Analysis of both questionnaire and interview data revealed similar patterns in a number of interests and practices within the different major groups of respondents. Factors examined included: expressed subject-matter interests, incidence of membership in professional societies, attendance at professional meetings, regular scanning of journal literature, use of books and published secondary sources, and incidence of informal communication with colleagues in various fields.

Almost all respondents sampled reported subject-matter interests within their own fields. About five-sixths of the linguists and foreign language specialists belonged to at least one professional organization, and three-fifths of the linguists and slightly under half of the foreign language specialists had in the previous year attended at least one professional meeting in their major field. Almost all interview subjects reported scanning at least two journals, using books and talking with colleagues in their own fields.

With regard to fields outside their own, most linguists displayed interest in foreign language disciplines, while the number concerned with other related disciplines was considerably smaller. Interest in disciplines outside of languages and linguistics was spread out rather thinly, a very small number of linguists demonstrating interest in each.

In this connection the foreign language specialists questioned confined themselves for the most part to the particular languages and literatures in which they specialized. A relatively small percentage had an interest in the linguistic aspects of their subject and an even smaller percentage belonged to linguistics organizations, attended linguistics meetings, and used published sources in linguistics. Most did not, although some interview subjects reported personal contacts with linguists. Few used published sources or described informal contacts in other fields. Their preferences in journals indicated a strong interest in literary studies in their chosen languages as opposed to interests in language science.

As a group, the professionals sampled in other fields indicated little interest in fields outside their own, except for a fraction who displayed some interest in linguistics or foreign languages. This fraction, representing many different fields, indicated an interest in differing aspects of linguistics or languages.

Subjects in the commonly taught languages for the most part restricted their subject-matter interests, society membership, meeting attendance, journal reading, use of other published sources, and professional contacts to foreign languages, and to a lesser extent, education. Exotic language specialists, on the other hand, both linguists and non-linguists, reported subject-matter interests, society memberships, meeting attendance, use of published sources, and contacts in linguistics, foreign languages, anthropology, and area studies.

In almost every case fewer people sought information in outside fields (through societies, meetings, professional literature, or personal contact) than expressed a special interest in them. There was usually a decrease in the number of respondents from those expressing special interests in a field, through those holding society membership associated with a field, to those attending meetings or reading journals within the field. For interview subjects discussion with professionals in an outside field was by far the most frequent type of contact with that field.

As regards information needs and problems, the linguists interviewed revealed striking differences among themselves. One identifiable type which emerged was the managerial linguist whose concern was mainly with people, programs, and substantive information which had a direct bearing on decision-making and policy formulation. Another was the active linguist or well-known researcher whose specific information needs were more diversified. Both types satisfied many of their information needs through informal communication, for which they had great opportunity. A third was the linguist working in an esoteric area. It was usually easy to keep abreast of the relatively small amount of scholarship in such areas, especially since the scholars working in these areas often knew each other and kept each other posted informally. A fourth was the isolated worker, who had to keep up through the available published sources, unpublished papers, and professional meetings. The typical Washington linguist, who did not fall into any of these categories, was more reliant on published sources but complained that he could not keep up with the literature. He often lacked the live information resources to which the other linguists described had access.

Language teachers, in spite of differences of position, status, and place of employment, reported very similar needs for information on teaching materials and methodology. There was an abundance of the former in English (both ESOL and English as a Native Language [ENL]) and the commonly taught languages, and a dearth of it in the exotic languages. Guidance on methodology seemed to come most often through discussions among teachers and their superiors. To a lesser extent teachers also needed information about the language itself; here grammars, texts, and dictionaries played an important role as reference materials. Many language teachers, especially among the questionnaire respondents, seemed oriented more toward literature than toward grammar.

People interviewed in fields other than languages and linguistics reported information problems similar in kind to those of linguists.

The preceding description of linguists in esoteric areas is equally applicable to both linguists and non-linguists in the exotic languages. Three problems faced by those working in such languages were the lack of teaching materials at all levels, the difficulty in obtaining and checking data, and the inaccessibility of certain important works.

Informal communication was found to be an important source of information for almost all interview subjects. The lines of such communication described a number of basically separate language science communities in the Washington area, communities which could be defined by the major field and work activities of the participants. Some of them constituted subdivisions of similar groups on a national or international level.

As regards communication with out of town colleagues, most full-fledged scholars and researchers were distinguished by occupying places in a group of others on their own level. Other subjects participated in such communication but did not seem to form part of well-defined groups.

The great majority of reported instances of informal communication involved one or more of the following subjects: the specific work of the parties, subjects in which at least one of the parties was an expert, current developments or research in progress in the specialty of the parties, people and programs, and the literature of a specialty.

In regard to certain specialized information services and media, linguists and researchers in other fields reported moderate to great use of technical reports, while foreign language teachers did not. The two principal complaints voiced in this connection were that technical reports were not announced or documented in any systematic way and that they were often inaccessible.

Of the minority of interview subjects who used the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system, several were inconvenienced by lack of microfiche readers. Non-users complained that too much time and effort was required to obtain desirable results.

Abstracts were described as useful by some, both as a direct source of information and as a bibliographical tool; others found locating them too much trouble. Most interview subjects used bibliographies and said they would prefer them with non-evaluative annotations.

Attitudes toward linguistics among non-linguists surveyed varied considerably. Some of the teachers and scholars in the language fields were favorable to linguistics, some were unfavorable, and some knew nothing about it. Among those generally favorable, many felt a need for more and better interpretation of the findings of linguistics.

There seemed to be more non-linguists favorably inclined toward linguistics in the exotic than in the commonly taught languages. Researchers in other fields, on the other hand, usually did not express feelings for or against linguistics; they accepted its existence and, for the most part, continued on their own way without recourse to it, except for consultation with linguists. Non-linguists on the whole had some degree of difficulty in reading the literature of the field, since they usually did not have the background necessary to read and evaluate it.

1. Introduction

The following report is a case study of communication in the language sciences in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Its purpose was to examine the information needs, practices and problems of professional persons at various levels who are concerned with information generated by the language sciences. Henceforth, this large and heterogeneous group is referred to as language professionals, since no standard term encompasses the range of disciplines within the group under study.

A number of writers (e.g., Garvey and Griffith, 1963-68; Menzel, 1966; Herner and Herner, 1968) have concluded that it is desirable before introducing innovations to investigate thoroughly the workings of the information exchange process, including both the function of existing services and the current information activities of individual scientists and scholars. Such knowledge can suggest which innovations are most needed, which are likely to be accepted and which rejected, and can generally predict the effects a given innovation might have on the rest of the system. In line with these considerations, the present study was undertaken as one of a series intended to cast light on characteristics and activities of users and on the operation of existing means of storing and disseminating information concerned with language. The special rationale of the present study was to locate and to obtain data on the broadest range of professionals, including those persons who would not normally be found in professional societies.

The areas of principal interest were:

1. The professional characteristics of the people working in the language sciences, their major fields, academic background, and professional activities;
2. The types of information desired by language professionals, the sources consulted, the problems encountered in obtaining needed information, and the role of the various channels of information in the process of information exchange;
3. The relationship among different areas in the language sciences in terms of the flow of information and overlap of subject-matter interests.

Washington, D.C. was selected as the subject of the study for two reasons: first, it is the location of the Language Information Network and Clearinghouse System (LINCS) project of the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and therefore easily accessible; second, it has a broad cross-section of institutions and activities, the range of which would be difficult to find elsewhere. Although there are many unusual institutions in Washington, especially in the federal sector, the situation of language professionals here does not seem to differ from that of language professionals in other places in the U.S. as much as might be expected.[1] For purposes of this study, the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area was taken to include the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges counties in Maryland, and Fairfax County and the cities of Arlington and Alexandria, in Virginia.

The LINCS definition of the scope of the language sciences includes those areas of language study which approach the subject from a scientific point of view. This includes linguistics; the grammar and language teaching aspects of the language disciplines (including English); and subdisciplines and study areas of a wide range of other fields, including speech, psychology sociology, anthropology, biology, mathematics, philosophy, education, computer science, information science, area studies, and perhaps others. The common features shared by these fields are a subject matter, language, and a general approach, the scientific.

No attempt was made to sample the various disciplines in proportion to their representation in the Washington, D.C. area (unknown) or to their number nationally (as estimated from degrees granted or society membership). For this preliminary study, the decision was made to focus the study on linguistics, and on activities such as language teaching and cross-disciplinary research on language, which are clearly related to linguistics and draw upon the scientific literature of linguistics.

The principal categories used in discussing the language professionals who served as the subjects of this study were major field, work activity, and, where applicable, subject language. Two other obvious categories which could have been employed, but were not, were degree level and place of employment. These factors generally did not vary independently of field, activity, or language dealt with.

---

[1] A comparison between Linguistic Society of America members residing in Washington and responding to the questionnaire survey and a sample of the national membership responding to a similar questionnaire revealed few differences which could not be accounted for by major professional activity.

Early in the analysis, it became evident that respondents could be most usefully grouped by combining work activity and subject area. Linguists, language specialists (in foreign languages, English for Speakers of Other Languages [ESOL], and English[2]), and professionals in other fields were the groupings chosen. For certain analyses language specialists were further subdivided into teachers and scholars. Such subdivisions were not made for the other two groupings because they were populated mainly by people whose principal interest was research, with teaching as a side activity. Many language specialists in English and the most commonly taught foreign languages (e.g., French, Spanish, and German) had no professional activity other than teaching. However, there were very few persons in the exotic languages whose professional responsibilities were limited to teaching. Differences associated with the type of language with which an individual was concerned are, therefore, discussed in this report.

---

[2] The designation language specialist includes specialists in English as a Native Language as well as foreign language and ESOL specialists. The designation foreign language specialist excludes specialists in English as a Native Language. The latter are included sometimes with language specialists and sometimes with professionals in other fields.

2. Method

The study was conducted over a period of one year by one full-time investigator with consultative and clerical assistance.[3] The principal methods used were a questionnaire survey, designed to obtain objective data on the community of language professionals, and a series of interviews, designed to explore the individual's use of information in his own work setting. Copies of the instruments appear in Appendices A and B.

The questionnaire was mailed with a letter of explanation to 750 people in the Washington, D.C. area (excluding all interviewees). About 130 questionnaires were returned as undeliverable. Of the remaining 620, about 160 were filled out and returned, a return rate of approximately 25%.[4] After 100 questionnaires had come in, an additional question (see Appendix C) on the importance of various fields as sources of information went out to respondents, who, in turn, returned 90 of these forms.

The mailing list was drawn from membership lists of professional organizations, CAL departmental mailing lists, and other sources. Only District of Columbia area residents were chosen. Membership lists used included the 1968 directory of the Linguistic Society of America; the 1968 membership list of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages; the list of subscribers to The Finite String, the publication of the Association for Computational Linguistics;the list of members of the Special-Interest Group in Automatic Language Processing of the American Society for Information Science; the membership list of the Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages; and that of the Washington Linguistics Club. CAL lists consulted included those of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse for Linguistics, The

---

[3] The investigator has completed all requirements for her doctorate in linguistics except the dissertation. Her principal training was in linguistics and Near Eastern languages.

[4] The response rate was low, but this was anticipated in view of the sources of the sample (see below). Other experiences in conducting studies of language professionals suggest that the respondents include a disproportionate number of persons who would be directly concerned with LINCS.

Linguistic Reporter, Language Research in Progress, as well as the Inventory of Projects and Activities in Reading and English and the linguistics and allied specialties component of the National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel. Other sources included the lists of people teaching language-related courses appearing in the bulletins of most local universities and colleges,[5] the CAL staff list, and the lists of Georgetown Round Table registrants for 1965 and 1966. Unfortunately many of these lists were out of date. About one-sixth of the listed persons had left the area while newcomers were often omitted. The researchers in non-language fields in our sample were included largely because they had indicated an interest in languages or linguistics by joining an organization listed above or by having themselves put on CAL lists. Because of the basis for their selection, they cannot be regarded as necessarily representative of all those in their disciplines who work with language, but rather, of those in a smaller subset whose interests focus more closely on linguistics.

The sample to be interviewed was systematically selected to represent a broad range of work activities, settings, and specialties. A total of about seventy interviews were conducted, twenty-six of which were with linguists, twenty-three with foreign language specialists, and the rest with people in education, psychology, speech, mathematics, anthropology, and speech perception. The reader should note that there were occasional deviations from the interview schedule.

---

[5] Included were those listed as teaching linguistics courses; first and second year language courses; courses in the structure, history and dialects of various languages; plus any courses in language science subfields or other disciplines, e.g., psycholinguistics, speech pathology, and reading courses.

3. Professional Background and Work Activities of Language Professionals

This section deals with the professional characteristics of language professionals, including their level of academic training, their degree majors, their place of employment, and the professional activities in which they engaged. For the purposes of this discussion, the subjects were divided into three groups: linguists, foreign language specialists, and professionals in other fields. Additionally, there is a short discussion of characteristics of individuals working in the exotic, as opposed to the commonly taught, foreign languages.

3.1. Linguists

3.1.1. Degree Level. Of the sixty-two linguists who answered the questionnaire, ten held a B.A. or B.S., thirty-two an M.A. or M.S., sixteen a doctorate, and four some foreign degree. Eighteen of the thirty-two who held an M.A. or M.S. reported that they were working on doctoral dissertations and one who held a B.A. was working on a master's thesis. If one takes this into account, then Ph.D.'s and Ph.D. candidates predominated in this sample, with thirty-four of the responding linguists at this level and only fifteen at the master's or almost-master's level.

Ph.D.'s also predominated in the group interviewed. Seventeen of the twenty-six linguists interviewed were Ph.D.'s; three more were beginning work on doctoral dissertations. It should be remembered, however, that potential interviewees were most likely to be chosen from the holders of professorships and the directors of research groups, positions for which the Ph.D. is a normal prerequisite. Many of the linguists in the questionnaire group were relatively recent graduates. Twenty-nine of the sixty-two had received their highest degree within the last five years, and an additional twenty-seven had received it six to fifteen years ago. The linguists who were interviewed tended to have held their highest degree longer; only six of the twenty-six linguists interviewed had received their degree within the last five years, while fourteen of them had received it six to fourteen years ago. Only seven of those answering the questionnaire and four of the group interviewed had received their highest degree more than fifteen years ago.

3.1.2. Degree Major. The great majority of linguists in both samples either held a degree in linguistics or were working on one.

Only eight of the sixty-two linguists in the questionnaire study and two of the twenty-six in the interview study had not majored in linguistics. Their degrees were in various other fields. In the questionnaire group, the only such field with sizable representation was foreign languages with nine majors. (See table 1.)

Table 1. Number of Linguists by Major Subject of Highest Degree

Major Subject	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	41	21
Foreign languages	9	-
ESOL	1	
Commonly taught foreign language	5	
Russian	1	
Classical language	1	
Exotic language	1	
English	2	2
Speech	1	-
Sociology	1	-
Anthropology	-	1
Education	1	-
Other	7	2
Total	62	26

Note: Of the twenty-one linguists in the questionnaire study who do not hold their highest degree in linguistics, twelve are currently doing work on an advanced degree in linguistics. Of the five such linguists in the interview study three are doing work on an advanced degree in linguistics.

3.1.3. Place of Employment. The linguists who made up the samples in this case study of Washington were concentrated in three types of institutions: universities, federal government agencies, and private non-profit research institutions (principally the Center for Applied Linguistics). (See table 2.) A few taught in smaller colleges but none in the public schools. The paucity of linguists in the colleges and elementary and secondary schools, both public and private, is probably typical at present, although the situation in college may well change as the field expands. There were a few linguists employed at commercial language schools, and in private research and development organizations (especially in the field of computational linguistics), although they do not appear in either of the samples.

Table 2. Number of Linguists by Type of Employer

Type of Employer	Questionnaire Respondents		Interview Subjects	
Universities	27		11	
Georgetown		19		7
Others		8		4
Colleges	4		1	
Federal government	10		7	
Private non-profit	17		7	
Center for Applied Linguistics		16		6
Private schools		1		-
Other		-		1
Private for profit	2		-	
Other	1		-	
Total	61		26	

3.1.4. Work Activity. The principal professional activities of Washington linguists in this sample appear to be teaching and various types of research. (See table 3.) Slightly less than half of each sample reported that teaching was a major (ranked first or second) time-consuming activity. If one includes dissertation writing and foreign language text preparation under the heading of research, then forty-nine of the sixty-two linguists returning questionnaires and twenty of the twenty-six linguists interviewed

Table 3. Number of Linguists by Primary and Secondary Work Activity

Work Activity	Questionnaire Respondents			Interview Subjects		
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
Teaching	16	10	26	8	3	11
Research	9	13	22	10	8	18
Text preparation	3	8	11	1	1	2
Dissertation, thesis	10	6	16	-	-	-
Administration	7	7	14	4	2	6
Writing, editing	7	3	10	2	2	4
Coursework	7	6	13	-	2	2
Other	3	4	7	-	4	4
Total responding 62						

reported research as one of their two most time-consuming professional activities. Administration, and writing and editing were third and fourth most important respectively, each being cited by fewer than one-fourth of each sample.

There are several interesting relationships among work activity, type of employer, and degree level. (See table 4 for a cross-tabulation of the first two.) The chief activities of university faculty members in linguistics were teaching and research, although a number of interview subjects reported that they also gave considerable time to administrative questions and/or counseling students, reading theses and dissertations, and correcting comprehensive examinations.

Table 4. Number of Linguists by Work Activity and Type of Employer

Work Activity	Univ.	Colleges	Fed. Gov.	CAL	Private Schools	Lang. Schools	Total
Teaching	18	3	2	1	1	1	26
Research	7	1	3	10	-	-	21
Text preparation	5	-	3	2	-	-	10
Dissertation	11	1	2	1	-	-	15
Administration	3	1	5	4	-	-	13
Writing, editing	-	-	-	10	-	-	10
Coursework	7	1	1	2	1	1	13
Other	22	1	2	1	-	1	27
Total responding							60

Source: D. C. Case Study Questionnaire Survey

Most, if not all of the university-based linguists, held a Ph.D. The questionnaire sample also included a number of graduate students in linguistics, many of whom were teaching as well as working on dissertations and courses. Those few linguists working at small colleges were engaged almost exclusively in teaching either linguistics or foreign languages. They were at the master's level in training, and several were studying for advanced degrees.

Washington linguists in the federal government carried on a wide range of professional activities. A few taught linguistics, generally as a secondary function of supervisory and administrative positions in agencies where foreign language instruction was carried out. Generally, in such agencies, native speakers taught and linguists supervised them and prepared teaching and testing materials. The latter generally had titles like scientific linguist. At other agencies where linguists were working as full-time researchers, they often had a title other than linguist, such as systems analyst, because of the absence of civil service titles for linguistic research. Several linguists worked in administrative positions in agencies which administered grants or contracts for linguistics and foreign-language research. Most government linguists held doctorates or were writing dissertations.

Almost everyone in each sample in the private non-profit institution category worked at the Center for Applied Linguistics, whose activities include both service and research functions. Among the former are the conduct of studies on language problems, compilation of bibliographies, and abstracting and indexing. Several programs are engaged in substantive linguistic research. To a limited extent such research is also carried on in a few other such institutions in the area. The main focus of such research work in Washington is usually applied linguistics (language teaching, both foreign and native, and related problems).

At several of the private language schools there were a few linguists performing functions similar to those of linguists in government agencies, the language teaching systems being organized similarly. Linguists in these positions were often young Ph.D. candidates working on dissertations part-time.

3.2. Foreign Language Specialists.

3.2.1. Language Field. The language distribution among the foreign language specialists sampled appears in Table 5. The category of unspecified foreign languages included persons concerned with foreign language teaching per se as well as several philologists. The languages are divided into the broad categories of ESOL, commonly taught (French, Spanish, and German), other European (Italian, Portuguese, and Russian)[6], classical, and exotic (all others). Note the disparity in numbers of persons in the questionnaire sample between the commonly taught languages (French, Spanish and German) and the exotic languages. There were very few specialists in the latter group or in the Italian, Portuguese, and Russian group.

---

[6] There is apparently a continuum of modern foreign languages from commonly taught to exotic, but all the languages represented in the samples apart from these three (and French, Spanish, and German) were clearly exotic.

Table 5. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Language

Language	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Unspecified foreign languages	1	4
ESOL	7	7
Commonly taught foreign languages	32	5
French	13	1
Spanish	15	3
German	4	1
Other European languages	9	1
Italian	-	1
Portuguese	1	-
Russian	8	-
Classical languages	5	-
Exotic languages	6	4
Arabic	-	2
Chinese	3	1
Japanese	1	-
Swahili	1	-
Indonesian	1	-
Uralic	-	1
Total	60	21

3.2.2. Degree Level. With respect to highest degree held, statistics for foreign language specialists are similar to those for linguists; of sixty-one questionnaire respondents, eight held a B.A. or B.S., thirty an M.A. or M.S., nineteen a Ph.D., and four some foreign degree. However, only a few of the holders of a master's degree had completed most requirements for the doctorate. Ph.D. and Ph.D. candidates on the one hand, and master's level people (exclusive, of course, of those working on dissertations) on the other, were almost evenly balanced in this sample.

Since the doctorate is a prerequisite mainly for administration or teaching literature it is not surprising that foreign language teachers were most often at the master's level. A sampling of foreign language specialists which excluded more literature specialists (as not being language scientists) and included more high school foreign language teachers might well have an even higher percentage at the master's level and a lower percentage at the doctoral level.

Many of the foreign language specialists in the questionnaire sample seem to have been professionally active a long time:

only eighteen of the sixty respondents had received their highest degree in the last five years, whereas twenty-five had received it more than fifteen years ago.

3.2.3. Degree Major. Most of the foreign language specialists sampled had majored in foreign languages. (See table 6.) A few, all in ESOL, had majored in English. It should be noted, however, that twenty-two of the fifty-six people who answered this item in the questionnaire and eleven of the seventeen people interviewed had majored in subjects other than the foreign language discipline with which they now identified themselves. Several different fields were mentioned. In a number of cases, at least among the interviewees, the subjects were native speakers of the language they taught; this, rather than their academic training, was the basis for their present professional activities.

Table 6. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Major Subject of Highest Degree

Major Subject	Questionnaire Respondents		Interview Subjects	
Linguistics	3		3	
Foreign languages	40		9	
Commonly taught foreign language		30		7
Slavic language		3		-
Classical language		5		-
Exotic language		2		2
English, comparative literature	3		4	
Education	3		-	
Other	7		1	
Total	56[a]		17[b]	

[a] Of the fifty-six people replying to this question in the questionnaire study, twenty-two had major subjects that differed from the foreign language discipline with which they identified themselves. None of these were currently working on advanced degrees in their foreign language discipline.

[b] Of the seventeen people replying to this question in the interview study eleven had major subjects that differed from their foreign language discipline. However, of these, four did not identify themselves with any specific language, although they once majored in one. Four were in ESOL and majored in English literature

3.2.4. Place of Employment. Many of the foreign language specialists who returned the questionnaire held positions at universities or colleges. (See table 7.) Most of the rest were employed by private secondary schools, public schools, or private language schools. Federal government employees in this group worked in a number of agencies with language concerns, not just in those concerned with foreign language teaching.

Table 7. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Type of Employer

Type of Employer	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Universities	24	6
Colleges	14	1
Federal government	8	6
Private non-profit	5	1
Center for Applied Linguistics	2	1
Private schools	3	-
Private language schools	2	5
Public schools	5	2
Total	58	21

3.2.5. Work Activity. A majority of people in both samples were engaged in teaching; a smaller number (about one-fourth of the questionnaire sample) performed administrative functions. (See table 8.) Some persons indicated research as a major activity,

Table 8. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Primary and Secondary Work Activity

Work Activity	Questionnaire Respondents			Interview Subjects		
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
Teaching	38	12	50	11	3	14
Research	3	6	9	3	-	3
Text preparation	2	4	6	-	6	6
Dissertation	1	6	7	-	-	-
Administration	8	7	15	7	1	8
Writing, editing	2	6	8	-	-	-
Coursework	2	7	9	-	3	3
Other	5	9	14	1	1	2
Total responding	61			20		

but not nearly as many as among the linguists or specialists in other fields.

Almost all those working at universities and colleges (twenty-three of the twenty-four persons affiliated with a university and thirteen of the fourteen college faculty in the questionnaire sample) reported teaching to be a major time-consuming activity. (See table 9.) About one-third of those at universities said that research or materials preparation was a major activity. Only a few people at either colleges or universities mentioned other activities as major. Foreign language specialists employed by the federal government were engaged in a variety of different activities, no one of which predominated. At public, private and commercial language schools, as at colleges and universities, teaching was the predominant activity, and other activities were usually supportive, involving administration or the preparation of text supplements and drill materials.

Table 9. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Work Activity and Type of Employer

Work Activity	Univ.	Colleges	Fed. Gov.	CAL	Private Schools	Lang. Schools	Public Schools	Total
Teaching	23	13	3	-	3	-	5	47
Research	5	1	2	-	-	1	-	9
Text preparation	2	1	2	-	-	-	-	5
Dissertation	4	2	-	-	-	-	1	7
Administration	5	3	3	-	1	1	-	13
Writing, editing	2	1	-	2	-	1	1	7
Coursework	5	3	1	-	-	-	1	10
Other	4	2	3	2	1	-	2	14
Total responding								58

Source: D.C. Case Study Questionnaire Survey

3.3. Professionals in Other Fields.

A wide range of specialties are represented under this heading. (See table 10.) The generalizations one could reasonably make about a group that includes speech therapists, computer programmers, English professors, and a psychiatrist are necessarily limited. However, for purposes of describing the sample and of determining the usefulness to such professionals of potential services of LINCS, certain generalizations are appropriate.

Table 10. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Field of Specialization

Field of Specialization	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
English	5	-
Education	6	9
General education	-	4
English education	3	2
Special education	1	-
Reading	-	3
Educational psychology	2	-
Speech	8	3
Psychology	3	5
Psychiatry	1	-
Anthropology	1	1
Mathematics	1	1
Computer science	5	-
Information science	4	-
Area studies	2	-
Speech perception	-	1
Other	2	-
Total	38	20

It should be noted that the names of persons surveyed by the questionnaire were obtained from sources such as CAL mailing lists, membership lists of the Linguistic Society of America (LSA) and the Washington Linguistics Club, and other similar lists of people who thus indicated at least a passing interest in linguistics and/or foreign languages. People in these fields who were interested in language only as studied by their own discipline, but not in linguistics or foreign languages, were less likely to appear on the lists used as sources. Moreover, people with some interest in linguistics would probably be more likely to return a questionnaire sent out by the Center for Applied Linguistics.

3.3.1. Degree Level. Among the group as a whole, there were four who held a B.A. or B.S., sixteen who held an M.A. or M.S., fourteen who held a Ph.D., three who held a foreign degree, and one who had no degree. The holders of different level degrees were distributed fairly evenly among the various fields with two exceptions: all psychologists and all mathematicians in both samples held the doctorate.

3.3.2. Degree Major. (See table 11.) Eleven of the thirty-five questionnaire respondents had majored in a field other than that with which they currently identified themselves, but among the interviewees only two of the nineteen respondents had done so. In most instances, the field of original training was not in the language sciences.

Table 11. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Major Subject of Highest Degree and Present Field of Specialization

Field of Specialization	Major Subject of Highest Degree	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Special education	Psychology	1	-
Speech	English	1	-
	Education	-	1
	Special education	1	-
Computer science	Linguistics	1	-
	Mathematics	2	-
	Law	1	-
Information science	Chemistry	2	-
	Mechanical engineering	1	-
	Philosophy	1	-
Reading	Psychology	-	1
Total having degrees in fields other than present area of specialization		11	2
Total with degrees matching specialization		24	17
Total		35	19

3.3.3. Place of Employment. Questionnaire respondents in this group worked at various types of institutions, but the majority were with universities, colleges or the federal government. Interview subjects were more evenly distributed among the different types of institutions represented. (See table 12.)

Table 12. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Type of Employer

Type of Employer	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Universities	10	6
Colleges	8	1
Federal government agencies	13	3
Quasi non-governmental institutions	-	3
Private non-profit institutions	3	4
Private for-profit institutions	3	1
Public schools	1	2
Total	38	20

3.3.4. Work Activity. Respondents in this group located at universities were engaged primarily in teaching and research. (See tables 13 and 14.) Most of those in the sample were faculty members rather than graduate students. Teaching was also the principal activity of those at the colleges; six out of the eight in the questionnaire group were in English or speech.

Table 13. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Primary and Secondary Work Activity

Work Activity	Questionnaire Respondents			Interview Subjects		
	Primary	Secondary	Total	Primary	Secondary	Total
Teaching	12	5	17	2	4	6
Research	13	9	22	9	1	10
Text preparation	1	–	1	1	–	1
Dissertation	–	1	1	–	–	–
Administration	5	4	9	7	3	10
Writing, editing	1	5	6	–	2	2
Coursework	1	3	4	–	–	–
Other	4	4	8	1	3	4
Total responding	37			20		

Table 14. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Work Activity and Type of Employer

Work Activity	Univ.	Colleges	Fed. Gov.	CAL	Public Schools	Private for-Profit	Total
Teaching	8	7	–	1	1	–	17
Research	7	2	7	2	–	3	21
Text preparation	–	–	–	1	–	–	1
Dissertation	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
Administration	1	2	4	–	1	1	9
Writing, editing	1	–	3	1	–	1	6
Coursework	1	1	2	–	–	–	4
Other	2	2	7	1	–	–	12
Total responding							38

Source: D. C. Case Study Questionnaire Survey

Federal government employees in this group carried on a variety of activities. Slightly over half (seven out of thirteen questionnaire respondents) listed research as a major activity. No other single activity was prominently mentioned. The wide range

of fields, degree levels, and work activities in even this limited sample reflect the diversity of activity in government agencies.

Private research and development and consulting corporations, both profit-making and non-profit, also carry on diverse activities, and the few respondents employed by them varied accordingly in background. Their principal activities were research and consultation on subjects ranging from programmed language instruction, to information system design, to compressed speech.

3.4. Specialization in Exotic as Opposed to Commonly Taught Foreign Languages

In the course of conducting the study, it became evident that there were substantial similarities in the professional characteristics and activities of those subjects, whether or not they were linguists, who were working in languages taught relatively infrequently. Accordingly, an additional breakdown was made in the data.[7] Of the languages represented in the sample, Russian, Portuguese, and Italian seem to fall in between the commonly taught and the exotic languages in most respects. Because few respondents worked in these languages they are not discussed in this section. Other languages represented are henceforth referred to as exotic, with two exceptions. The first is ESOL; ESOL teachers seemed to share many of the characteristics of those in the commonly taught languages, but since English is a native language in this country and since ESOL has a different academic tradition, it is omitted from this discussion. The second exception is classical languages, usually Latin and Greek. Because there were too few data on people in classical languages to permit one to generalize confidently about them, they are not discussed here. They seemed, however, more like the teachers and scholars of the commonly taught languages than any other group.

3.4.1. Professional Identification. Many people whose work was primarily in the exotic languages identified themselves as linguists rather than as foreign language specialists. Of twelve interview subjects working principally in the exotic languages, six identified themselves as linguists, five as

---

[7] This breakdown is discussed here because it cuts across the three exclusive categories normally used to categorize subjects.

language specialists, and one as an anthropologist. Of six working principally in the commonly taught languages, none identified himself as a linguist; one was in education and the rest were in foreign languages. Among questionnaire respondents, of thirty-six in the commonly taught languages only three said they were linguists; of fourteen in the exotic languages, eight said they were linguists. For this discussion only, the designations exotic language specialist and French (or Spanish or German) specialist will refer to both linguists and language specialists.

3.4.2. Degree Level. Statistics in both samples show a predominance of Ph.D.'s and Ph.D. candidates working in the exotic languages. Two out of the three interview subjects still at the master's level planned to go on for a doctorate in the near future. Of the six interviewees in the commonly taught languages, two held foreign degrees and were from the country whose language they were teaching. Only one held a doctorate. The other three were at the bachelor's or master's level.

3.4.3. Degree Major. One can safely assume that most of the people working with a language of which they were not native speakers had training in that language. Those in the interview sample did; the questionnaire did not ask for the respondents' native language, so it was impossible to separate native from non-native speakers. The specialists in French, Spanish, or German had almost all majored in languages. Of the thirty-six questionnaire respondents only five had not: three had majored in linguistics and two in other subjects. Of the six interview subjects who were not native speakers of the languages they were teaching four had majored in foreign languages.

In contrast, the majority of subjects working in the exotic languages had majored in linguistics; this majority included ten of the fourteen questionnaire respondents and seven of the twelve interview subjects. Only four of the fourteen in the first group and three of the twelve in the second had majored in foreign languages.

3.4.4. Place of Employment. The exotic language specialists in both samples worked at universities or for the government; only one was at a college. (There may be two or three at commercial language schools but none appeared in the samples.) In the commonly taught languages the picture was quite different. Although a number worked at universities, several also worked at colleges. A few others in the sample worked in public schools, private language schools, government agencies, and private secondary schools.

There are many more language teachers than those indicated in this sample teaching in the secondary schools, both public and private. As for the private language schools and the government agencies, it was hard to estimate the total amount of activity in the area of the commonly taught languages.

3.4.5. Work Activity. The work activities of specialists in the commonly taught languages and those of the exotic language specialists were rather similar, but the interview data suggested that teaching was a more important and more time-consuming activity for those in the former group. Among exotic language specialists research and preparation of both texts for general use and drills for their own classes seemed at least as important an activity as teaching, if not more so. Thus, in the exotic languages, the scholars and the teachers were frequently the same people and even high level scholars might teach first and second year courses in the language. This was seldom the case in the commonly taught languages, where the high level scholars usually taught literature courses or, more occasionally, courses in the structure, dialects, or history of the language.

4. The Relative Importance and Role of Various Sources of Information

Questionnaire respondents rated various sources of information on a five-point scale from "Of no importance" to "Very important". As table 15 indicates, books and journals were rated most frequently as important sources by the three groups of questionnaire respondents (linguists, foreign language specialists, and others). With regard to journals, most interviewees reported that they scanned at least two journals regularly, but only occasionally read an article. Colleagues at the same institution (hereafter immediate colleagues) were rated third most frequently by all groups of questionnaire respondents, and local colleagues and out of town colleagues were listed next by both linguists and foreign language specialists.

Table 15. Number of Respondents by Professional Category Rating Each Information Source "Very Important"

Information Source	Respondents by Category			
	Linguists	For. Lang. Specialists	Others	Total
Books	44	52	30	126
Journal articles	47	44	30	121
Document dissemination systems	11	12	9	32
Technical reports, other papers not for publication	14	12	17	43
Abstracts and abstract journals	11	8	15	34
Convention presentations	8	16	13	37
Local lectures	9	15	8	32
Staff meetings	6	13	7	26
Preprints	12	12	15	39
Correspondence	10	14	10	34
Immediate colleagues	26	25	17	68
D.C. colleagues	18	18	16	52
Out of town colleagues	17	16	15	48
Total responding	60	60	38	158

Source: D.C. Case Study Questionnaire Survey

Among interview subjects, linguists most often reported obtaining from formal written sources information on linguistic theory, on the analysis and discussion of issues in linguistics, on the grammar of various languages, and on general reference questions. Journals were mentioned frequently as a means of keeping current. Linguists informed their colleagues about all phases of the work they were doing. From them they received many references to other sources, most of their information on research in progress, a major portion of their knowledge of current developments, and much of the information they needed in fields outside languages and linguistics.

Some of the foreign language specialists interviewed obtained general ideas on teaching techniques from the literature. They also used the literature, especially books, for grammatical information on their subject language. Colleagues supplied information on specific and general techniques for teaching, and evaluations of new materials coming out. Colleagues who were native speakers sometimes provided grammatical information.

Like the linguists, the interviewed specialists in other fields obtained from the literature of their own fields information on theory, analysis and discussion, general reference questions, and current developments. Also, like the linguists, they discussed their own work with their colleagues and acquired references, research in progress, and current awareness knowledge from them, along with many types of information in fields not their own.

Questionnaire respondents were asked to list the sources they found best for specific purposes. Most rated books and journals high for all purposes, while they cited other sources only infrequently. They mentioned books and journals frequently as sources for past findings and specific facts on a subject, for theory, and for current developments in their fields in general, as well as in their areas of specialization. Books were listed more frequently than journals as a source for past findings, while journals were more important for purposes of current awareness. Linguists mentioned colleagues mainly as a source of ideas for new work and methodology. The response alternatives printed in the questionnaire separated two aspects of national meetings relevant here, formal presentations and informal discussions with colleagues. Because these aspects were listed separately in the questionnaire, the replies could not accurately reflect the overall role of national meetings. However, many interview subjects mentioned them as being quite important in furnishing information on current developments.

Questionnaire items on secondary sources concerned the ones used and the ones found most helpful. Secondary sources were defined in the questionnaire as regular scanning of periodical literature; asking colleagues; citations in books, journal articles; asking librarians or other professional information personnel; accidental exposure to the material itself; general bibliographies (e.g., MLA Bibliography, Linguistic Bibliography, etc.); subject specialty bibliographies; research in progress services; abstracts, abstract journals; index publications; critical reviews; state of the art, summary reviews; and programs and proceedings of scientific meetings. The three most frequently used by all three groups, linguists, foreign language specialists, and others, were regular scanning of periodical literature, citations in books and journal articles, and asking colleagues. (See table 16.) Other sources checked by more than half of each group

Table 16. Number of Respondents by Professional Category Indicating Secondary Information Sources Used

Secondary Information Sources	Respondents by Category			
	Linguists	For. Lang. Specialists	Others	Total
Regular scanning of periodical literature	55	54	35	144
Colleagues	57	41	32	130
Citations in books, journal articles	57	52	34	143
Librarians	30	29	17	76
Accidental discovery of material	46	41	26	113
General bibliographies	32	31	17	80
Subject-specialty bibliographies	40	33	22	95
Research in progress services	20	9	11	40
Abstracts, abstract journals	23	20	18	61
Index publications	8	11	8	27
Critical reviews	42	34	26	102
Summary reviews	34	20	24	78
Programs and proceedings of meetings	40	26	28	94
Total responding	61	59	38	158

Source: D.C. Case Study Questionnaire Survey were accidental exposure to the material desired, subject-specialty bibliographies, critical reviews, and programs and proceedings of meetings. The foreign language specialists used most sources less than the linguists and others did.

Cited as most helpful secondary sources were regular scanning of periodical literature, asking colleagues, and citations in books or journals, with regular scanning rated highest by all three groups. (See table 17.) Other sources were rated far lower.

Table 17. Number of Respondents by Professional Category Indicating Most Helpful Secondary Information Source Used

Secondary Information Source	Respondents by Category			
	Linguists	For. Lang. Specialists	Others	Total
Regular scanning	39	43	23	105
Ask colleagues	30	15	11	56
Citations in books, journal articles	21	18	13	52
Librarians	4	5	3	12
Accidental exposure	1	4	3	8
General bibliographies	11	10	3	24
Subject- specialty bibliographies	4	3	2	9
Research in progress services	4	0	1	5
Abstracts, abstract journals	1	2	5	8
Index publications	0	1	1	2
Critical reviews	4	4	3	11
Summary reviews	2	1	2	5
Programs and proceedings of meetings	0	2	3	5
Total responding	59	57	36	152

Source: D. C. Case Study Questionnaire Survey
Note: Some respondents listed as many as three sources as most helpful

Linguists and foreign language specialists mentioned general bibliographies more than professionals in the other fields did; professionals in the other fields mentioned abstracts more than linguists and foreign language specialists did. This situation may reflect the availability of abstracts rather than any other differences between the two groups.

Interview subjects were not questioned about their general preferences in secondary sources. However, they were questioned about their use of certain types of secondary sources, such as bibliographies and abstracts, and also about the role their colleagues played in information exchange.

The importance of informal communications as a secondary source emerged very clearly in the interviews.[8] It appeared to serve important functions which formal services might not easily duplicate. It was a personalized source which could be used selectively; it provided for annotation and evaluation as well as bibliographical reference; it was also convenient, especially in settings where knowledgeable people were at hand. Some respondents relied almost completely on colleagues. One linguist stated:

> I have a consultant, ______ . . . . I use the phone a lot and I'm therefore kept informed by someone like ______ of what's going on. He's more serious about that . . . . I keep up through the guys that really keep up.

Most others did not rely exclusively on colleagues, but for many they were generally the first resort and, on certain topics, the only source used, especially those outside their own field.

A speech pathologist stated:

> Someone who's even more important is our full-time research associate, who spends a lot of her time reading. I wish I could do more of this myself. She knows the literature thoroughly in this area. She's a walking computer. I can go to her, ask her a question, and she'll answer it or else direct me to the article.

Other language science specialists interviewed felt that word-of-mouth was their best secondary source because they considered formal secondary sources quite inadequate. This seemed truer of linguists than of researchers in other fields such as psychology, where the secondary sources were better developed. However, the psychologists in the present sample also relied heavily on informal communication.

---

[8] Informal communication is discussed in more detail in the section on information flow in the context of the work situation (Section 6).

5. Society Membership and Meeting Attendance and the Use of Published Sources and Informal Contacts

In the following discussion of several means commonly used to locate or obtain information, the principal emphasis is on information media used, and the secondary on the disciplines generating the information used. The practices of the three main groups of respondents are reported separately.

5.1. Linguists

5.1.1. Society Membership and Meeting Attendance. Table 18 shows the number of linguists in the questionnaire and interview samples reporting membership in various professional societies.

Table 18. Number of Linguists by Type of Professional Society Affiliation

Type of Professional Society Affiliation	Questionnaire Respondents		Interview Subjects	
Linguistics	51		20	
Linguistic Society of America[a]		48		19
Other general linguistics societies		13		8
Societies in particular areas of general linguistics		3		3
Computational linguistics societies		3		3
Foreign languages	26		17	
Modern Language Association[a]		15		7
Foreign language teaching societies		4		4
ESOL societies		9		9
Commonly taught foreign language societies		5		2
Other European language societies		2		1
Exotic language societies		6		3
English societies	4		3	
Education societies	1		2	
Anthropology societies	6		3	
Computer science societies			-	
Information science societies	1		-	
Area studies societies	6		5	
Other societies	-		4	
None or no response	8		1	
Total responding		62		25

[a] Noted individually to indicate central role in the field.

The category of other general linguistics societies refers to organizations like the International Linguistics Association (formerly Linguistic Circle of New York), which encompasses all areas of linguistics. Societies in the category of particular areas of general linguistics are groups like the American Dialect Society which are limited to one subfield of general linguistics. In the category of foreign languages, commonly taught foreign languages includes professional organizations concerned with French, German, and Spanish and Portuguese (the last two constitute the scope of one organization). The category of other European languages refers to Italian and Slavic; and the category of exotic refers to all other languages.

Most, but not all, of those identifying themselves as linguists belonged to one or more societies concerned with general linguistics. Three linguists in each sample were members of the Association for Computational Linguistics.

Slightly under half the questionnaire respondents and two-thirds of the interview subjects said they belonged to one or more foreign language societies, affiliation being determined by the foreign language interests of the individual. Far fewer reported membership in societies primarily concerned with other fields. Six of the sixty-two questionnaire respondents and three of the twenty-five interviewees reported membership in anthropological societies. Six of the questionnaire respondents and five of the interviewees belonged to area studies associations.

Table 19 shows meeting attendance as reported by linguists in both samples. Attendance at meetings of local groups such as the Washington Linguistics Club was not included in these figures. Over half the questionnaire respondents and most of the interview subjects had attended meetings of broader-based linguistics groups in the preceding year. The high attendance at meetings in the category of applied linguistics is attributable chiefly to attendance at the Georgetown Round Table. It was included in this category in table 19 because of the applied nature of the themes of the recent meetings. The high figure was not surprising because about one-third of the linguists in the questionnaire sample and one-fourth of those in the interview sample were associated with Georgetown and because of the location of the meetings in Washington. Almost half the linguists who returned the questionnaire and most of those interviewed had attended other national meetings as well.

The expressed professional interests of linguists (more fully discussed in Section 8) were distributed across several fields

Table 19. Number of Linguists by Type of Professional Convention/ Conference Attended in Previous Year

Type of Professional Convention/ Conference Attended in Previous Year	Questionnaire Respondents		Interview Subjects	
Linguistics	37		21	
General linguistics		25		15
Particular areas of general linguistics		1		2
Applied linguistics		22		12
Computational linguistics		1		1
Psycholinguistics		-		1
Foreign languages	15		17	
Unspecified foreign language		5		8
Foreign language teaching		6		3
ESOL		6		3
Commonly taught language		-		1
Exotic language		3		3
English	-		1	
Education	4		3	
Speech	1		1	
Anthropology	1		-	
Area studies	4		6	
None or no response	17		2	
Total responding	62		24	

with linguistics obviously the most important. A relatively high interest was shown in foreign languages with a smattering of interest in various other fields. As one moved from expressed professional interests to society memberships to meeting attendance the number of people in each category generally diminished. For example, two thirds of the questionnaire respondents listed foreign language interests; less than half belonged to foreign language societies; only one-fourth attended a professional meeting in those fields. The last figure is noteworthy, since the LSA, MLA and various other organizations of language teachers have all held their annual meetings in the same city at approximately the same time for the last two years. In interpreting these data, the reader should remember that certain professional organizations such as the American Psychological Association and the American Speech and Hearing Association admit to membership only those meeting their particular requirements in qualification and training.

5.1.2. Published Sources. Data on this subject were supplied mainly by interview subjects. Of twenty-three linguists asked to specify the journals that they scanned with some regularity, twenty read or scanned linguistics journals. Eleven covered at least one journal dealing with foreign language scholarship. Two said that they did not scan journals at all. Only eight of the twenty-three reported scanning journals in fields outside of linguistics or foreign languages; these journals were spread over six fields. (See table 20.)

Table 20. Number of Linguists by Major Subject Area of Journals Scanned or Read

Major Subject Area of Journals Scanned or Read	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	20
Foreign languages	11
Psychology	3
Mathematics	1
Education	1
Anthropology	1
Area studies	1
Computer science	1
No journals scanned or read	2
Total responding	23

Source: D.C. Case Study Interviews

Of seventeen linguists asked about technical reports, twelve read them more than occasionally, but only one reported reading such reports in fields outside linguistics: this was in acoustic phonetics. Many interviewees complained that it was difficult to learn about the existence of technical reports in any field and to gain access to those they did learn about.

As for published secondary sources like abstracts and bibliographies, only three of twenty linguists questioned said they used such sources outside the fields of linguistics and foreign languages: one in psychology, one in speech, and one in computer science. Two more, both in psycholinguistics, cited LLBA: Language and Language Behavior Abstracts, which appears to be truly cross-disciplinary in nature.

Questionnaire respondents were asked to list ten or fewer journals that they would like to see covered by a current awareness

[9] service. The fifty-two linguists who answered this question specified about twenty-five different journals in linguistics and over thirty in philology and foreign languages. Eight linguistics journals were mentioned by ten people or more, and one journal dealing with language teaching achieved this distinction. This journal, cited by fifteen linguists, was Language Learning: a Journal of Applied Linguistics. Eight linguists mentioned The Modern Language Journal; six Foreign Language Annals. No more than four people mentioned any other journal and most of those mentioned were specific to one language or language group.

For other fields, the same situation prevailed. Linguists listed about thirty journals in anthropology, area studies, English, speech, psychology, education, mathematics, computer science, information science, and acoustics. Only two were cited by more than three people: five linguists mentioned the Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior and four The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America. Seventeen were each specified by only one person.

5.1.3. Informal Contacts. All linguists interviewed reported significant informal contacts with other linguists. Thirteen of

Table 21. Number of Linguists by Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts

Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	26
Foreign languages	13
English	2
Education	3
Psychology	9
Anthropology	2
Medicine	1
Psychiatry	1
Speech	1
Mathematics	1
Computer science	1
Phonetics	1
Total responding	26

Source: D.C. Case Study Interviews

---

[9] Replies to this item were expected to provide an indication of those journals central to the relevant areas, as well as an indication of those difficult to obtain. See Appendix D.

the twenty-six mentioned contacts with foreign language specialists, chiefly those concerned with the methodology of foreign language teaching and those who specialized in the same languages that they did. Significant contacts with people in any one of ten other fields were much more restricted, with one exception: nine linguists reported informal contacts with psychologists. Table 21 shows the range of these contacts. A later section of the report treats in greater detail informal communication and its relations to respondents' work.

5.2. Foreign Language Specialists

5.2.1. Society Membership and Meeting Attendance. As tables 22 and 23 illustrate, most foreign language specialists questioned belonged to professional organizations in their own field, and about half had attended meetings of these organizations in the previous

Table 22. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Type of Professional Society Affiliation

Type of Professional Society Affiliation	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Linguistics[a]	12	2
Linguistic Society of America	9	2
Other general linguistic societies	4	-
Foreign languages[a]	51	12
Modern Language Association	23	5
Foreign language teaching societies	15	3
ESOL	9	5
Commonly taught foreign language societies	23	4
Other European language societies	5	1
Classical language societies	4	-
Exotic language societies	2	2
Translators societies	5	-
English societies	1	2
Education societies	5	1
Area studies societies	6	2
Other societies	1	1
None or no response	6	6
Total responding	62	21

[a] Noted individually to indicate central role in field.

Table 23. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Type of Professional Convention/Conference Attended in Previous Year

Type of Professional Convention/ Conference Attended in Previous Year	Questionnaire Respondents		Interview Subjects	
Linguistics	14		7	
General linguistics		3		1
Applied linguistics		10		7
Computational linguistics		1		-
Foreign languages	29		10	
Unspecified foreign language		14		2
Foreign language teaching		12		4
ESOL		3		4
Commonly taught language		3		1
Other European language		3		-
Classical language		3		-
Exotic language		2		2
Translators		1		-
Education	6		-	
Area studies	2		-	
Other	1		-	
None or no response	21		8	
Total responding	62		19	

year. About one-fifth of the questionnaire respondents were members of a professional society concerned with linguistics. A similar number attended linguistics meetings, but the great majority of these attended only the Georgetown Round Table.

As was the case with linguists, a very small number of people belonged to societies and attended meetings in other fields. The range of fields was limited almost entirely to education and area studies. Three specialists in ESOL reported membership in the National Council of Teachers of English.

5.2.2. Published Sources. As table 24 indicates, most, but not all, of the twenty-one specialists interviewed read journals in their own discipline; several at least scanned linguistics journals; but almost no one read professional journals in other fields. Of seventeen people who mentioned specific book titles, four cited books on linguistics and almost all seventeen named books on foreign languages.

Table 24. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Major Subject Area of Journals Scanned or Read

Major Subject Area of Journals Scanned or Read	Interview Subjects	
Linguistics	6	
Foreign languages	15	
Unspecified foreign language		6
Foreign language teaching		4
Specific foreign language		13
English	1	
Area Studies	2	
No journals scanned or read	3	
Total responding	21	

Source: D.C. Case Study Interviews

Sixteen foreign language specialists mentioned published secondary sources; almost all used sources associated with the foreign language disciplines; three reported using secondary sources associated with area studies; and one person named Language and Language Behavior Abstracts.

The questionnaire item requesting nominations of journals for current-awareness coverage yielded approximately the same results as the interview data. A small number of foreign language specialists desired coverage of linguistics journals. Nine mentioned Language; five, Word; and between one and three people designated about ten others. Eight people cited Language Learning (which covers foreign language teaching and other areas of applied linguistics). Very little interest was shown in the journals of other fields. Of more significance was the respondents' interest in literature. Of the approximately eighty-five different journals cited in the field of foreign languages and literatures, the majority dealt mainly with literature.[10] (See Appendix D.)

5.2.3. Informal Contacts. Foreign language specialists interviewed seemed to have far greater contact with linguistics through informal contacts with linguists than through published sources. They did not appear to have appreciable contact with other fields through such informal communication. (See table 25.)

---

[10] This was determined by inspection of the journals or by consultation with scholars who were acquainted with the journals.

Table 25. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts

Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	17
Foreign languages	21
Education	2
Psychology	1
Area studies	2
Total responding	22

Source: D.C. Case Study Interviews

5.3. Professionals in Other Fields.

5.3.1. Society Membership and Meeting Attendance. Many respondents in both samples belonged to societies and had attended recent meetings in their own fields of study. (See tables 26 and 27.) About one-third of the questionnaire respondents were members

Table 26. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Type of Extradisciplinary Professional Society Affiliation

Type of Extradisciplinary Professional Society Affiliation	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Linguistics societies	12	1
Foreign language societies	7	3
Education societies	1	2
Psychology societies	1	-
Medical societies	-	1
Mathematics societies	2	-
Information science societies	2	-
Computer science societies	1	-
Area studies societies	1	-
Other societies	4	2
Total responding	35	20

Table 27. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Type of Professional Convention/Conference Attended in Previous Year

Type of Professional Convention/ Conference Attended in Previous Year	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	3	1
Foreign languages	5	1
Education	1	2
Psychology	2	1
Anthropology	1	1
Medical	-	1
Computer science	1	-
Area studies	1	-
Total responding	38	16

of linguistics societies; however, only three had attended linguistics meetings in the last year. One-fifth belonged to foreign language societies and five had attended professional meetings. Various respondents reported a smattering of society memberships and meeting attendance in a wide range of other fields, none of which were mentioned by more than two people. Those who belonged to linguistics societies were spread out over almost all the fields covered here: English, education, speech, psychology, psychiatry, mathematics, computer science, and information science. Interview subjects in other fields indicated almost no participation in societies or meetings outside their own fields.

5.3.2. Published Sources. Five of eighteen interviewees reported reading or scanning linguistics journals; four who were not psychologists mentioned psychology journals. Journals in other fields were cited by one or two people. (See table 28.)

Use of published secondary sources in outside fields was even more limited: two people mentioned sources in linguistics, two in foreign languages, three in psychology, and two mentioned LLBA. (One person may account for three or four of these mentions.)

Respondents to the questionnaire listed a large number of different journals that they would like to see covered by a current-awareness service. However, not many designated linguistics or

Table 28. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Major Subject Area (Other than Field of Specialization) of Journals Scanned or Read

Major Subject Area (Other than Field of Specialization) of Journals Scanned or Read	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	5
Foreign languages	1
English	1
Education	1
Psychology	4
Speech	1
Medicine	1
Computer science	1
Information science	1
Acoustics	2
Total responding	18

Source: D. C. Case Study Interviews

foreign language journals: about a dozen of the former and half a dozen of the latter were named. Six, the largest number requesting any single journal, specified Language. No more than three listed any other. Nine of the linguistics journals and six of the foreign language journals were mentioned by only one person each. Of the host of journals in other fields (about sixty-three were listed) none were named by more than four people and usually the number mentioning a particular journal was smaller.

5.3.3. Informal Contacts. As a channel for information outside their own fields, professionals in other fields made use of personal contact more frequently than they did of published sources. (See table 29.) Note especially that about half the interview sample mentioned professional contacts with linguists.

Table 29. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Fields of Specialization of Informal Contacts

Field of Specialization of Informal Contacts	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	10
Foreign languages	4
English	3
Education	4
Psychology	6
Sociology	1
Medicine	5
Psychiatry	1
Anthropology	1
Computer science	2
Information science	1
Other	1
Total responding	19

Source: D.C. Case Study Interviews

Note: Informal contacts with members of the subjects' own disciplines are not included.

6. Information Flow and Problems in the Context of Scientific and Professional Work.

6.1. Linguists

The majority of linguists interviewed reported that they required information primarily in the area of linguistics or of foreign language scholarship. The types of information they sought involved linguistic theory and data, research and teaching methodology, teaching materials for linguistics, linguistic analysis of various languages, discussion of linguistic issues, personnel, and organizations. Linguists generally reported problems in keeping abreast of current developments in view of the increasing magnitude and dispersal of the linguistic literature.

6.1.1. Managerial Linguists. Some linguists worked under circumstances which both created unusual problems and afforded unusual opportunities to obtain information, often through informal means. The managerial linguist was an example; his principal activity was administration in the areas of linguistics or language teaching. In Washington, managerial linguists worked at government agencies, at private research and education-oriented institutions, and at universities. There was probably a disproportionately high number of them here because of the presence of the federal government. Their information interests reflected their concern with service rather than functions involving research or teaching. Generally, these linguists wanted management information on people and programs. Who is running a good bilingual education program? Would _______ be a good candidate for _______? What are the possible sources for funding? Who is in charge of _______ division at the Office of Education? Where can I find a linguist fluent in _______? Most of their substantive concerns seemed to be related to broad questions of policy, usually in language teaching: Is the audio-lingual method the most effective way to teach a second language? Is it best to have native speakers as instructors?

These needs were satisfied almost entirely through informal means, telephoning or writing to people likely to have the answers. Managerial linguists saw their counterparts at various official functions and meetings, such as the Inter-Agency Language Round Table (a monthly meeting of government and non-government administrators working in language teaching) or receptions for visiting dignitaries. While some of their questions could be answered, and sometimes were, through recourse to directories, such information was frequently out of date even before it was published because of the high turnover in programs and personnel.

The following were typical administrators' comments:

> Every once in a while I do a telephonic sweep of this area to find out what's going on. . . . What's new? What sort of changes? What particular problems are they experiencing, maybe in financing or finding people? . . . I'm delighted to keep up with ________ [a certain advisory body] because it's very informative on a level that particularly interests me...it has to do with what organizations are doing that is of interest and relevance.

> Our program has contacts with ________ [various government agencies], so I have to meet formally and informally with members of their professional staffs. I also go to these people to recruit, in fact, I couldn't operate without them. One of my biggest immediate problems in coming to Washington was to establish contacts with these people in the local community.

Some linguists with administrative responsibilities also taught and engaged in research, and their administrative duties often gave them the opportunity for informal contacts with researchers in their area of interest. One such government linguist, who was interested in language teaching and whose job kept him in touch with linguists all over the country, said:

> One tries to keep up with the professional journals, but they don't really answer the questions I'm looking for. They're nice exercises, but they don't answer my type of question that I can get answered just by talking to people who have expertise.

Another, at a private institution:

> It's one of the best things about this job. I maintain contact with a lot of people. . . . Even where meetings with these people aren't directly linguistic, I talk to them about linguistics, at lunch, say, or in a car, or before and after meetings.

6.1.2. Active Linguists. There was some overlap between the group of managerial linguists just discussed and another small but important group, the active linguists, those who carry on much of the important research in the field and publish many of the articles. Their number in Washington was limited, but several who fell into this category were interviewed. In their role as researchers, they wanted to keep up with the latest developments and the research in progress in their own area as well as in linguistics in general. They too had an opportunity for informal communication with other researchers as well as access to certain non-published sources, such as research proposals, and they made use of these resources. One said:

> I find out what other people are doing to an extent by reading proposals for _______ [a government agency], and also by running workshops or attending conferences or national meetings. At the meetings I usually find myself talking to other people in the lobby and the halls rather than listening to the papers. Site visits for _______ [a government agency] are also a way of finding out what other people are doing . . . and then there are the meetings of the _______ Committee. It has a lot of the old guard on it. They aren't producing much now, but they have some good grad students, and I'm always interested in that.

These linguists traveled extensively to attend meetings, to give lectures, to consult, or to find out what others are doing. They followed the literature, but informal communication was their most important source of information overall.

Sometimes colleagues functioned as a secondary source; they were by far the most important secondary source for the active linguists interviewed. Two said:

> I read the journals in linguistics. . . I don't worry about missing much because my staff are all recent students who keep up with things.

> I'm able to stay abreast of current developments because of my contacts with people. They point me in the right directions as to what to read.

Neither the administrators nor the active linguists had much trouble getting information, at least not as compared to other linguists. Where problems existed, they were likely to result from the inaccessibility of unusual sources, for example:

> My main information problem is usually with information that nobody knows or that is available only from one or

> two people. Often the problem is a question of getting in touch with one man who may well be the only one who knows much about a given language or language family. . . . This is the way we usually find out what we need to know. We call up and ask experts. What is frustrating is when the single specialist in existence isn't available.

6.1.3. Researchers in Esoteric Areas. One can distinguish a third group of researchers on the basis of their common situation with regard to information in their specialties. They were not concerned with single subject-matter area; they were instead a large collection of small groups working in unrelated, esoteric areas. Most of the linguists working on exotic languages fell into this category, as would for instance someone working in such an area as two-dimensional languages (e.g. cattle brands). The existence of many areas of linguistic research actively pursued by fewer than a dozen researchers meant that there was little scholarship available in any one of them and few people to follow that scholarship.[11] Thus, the researchers studied had little trouble keeping current and did not worry overly about missing anything in the literature:

> I don't keep up with the literature. I've sort of found a corner where there isn't much activity. One of the only reasons I'd read is to see that it isn't already done. I'm pretty sure this is the case. . . . There isn't any stuff in my particular area now, it's narrow and peculiar. I don't really look for information, I don't have to.

Additionally, the small numbers involved in each of these areas usually knew each other and kept each other informed about their work:

> I'm generally aware of what's going on because I know the major centers of activity and the people there. When new things come out I know who will be putting them out and whose students will be writing dissertations.

In some cases little on-going work was ever published and information had to be obtained informally:

> It's fascinating that all the important information comes informally. Publication is so slow that the only way you

---

[11] The absolute numbers of linguists and languages in the world being of the same order of magnitude, the degree of specialization in linguistics may be unusually high.

> find out about something important is by having someone mention it. For example, if someone in my area in another place got interested in description of _______ [a language], he could read the literature and find out that about 1958 two great men in the field presented opposite views on how _______ ought to be described and studied. . . . This is in print. The next thing I know of comes about 1968. In between there were two theses, both unpublished. Yet there is a fair amount going on, and I'm aware of most of it.

Many linguists specializing in exotic languages exhibited a number of other characteristics and problems shared by non-linguists working in the same languages, as discussed in a later section.

6.1.4. Isolated Researchers. Another type of linguist with special information problems was the one who conducted research in an area where a number of other workers were productive, but who was isolated geographically from them. Such was the case of the transformational grammarians in the Washington area. At institutions elsewhere, however, where major theoretical work was going on, communication about that subject would probably be an everyday occurrence.[12]

Where a scholar was isolated, he necessarily relied on sources other than his immediate colleagues. Several linguists in this position, not all concerned with transformational grammar, discussed this problem. Books, journals, unpublished papers, and meetings were quite important to them in keeping up in the field. On the subject of keeping abreast of current developments, they said:

> I go to meetings and listen to papers. I also use the journals. . . . I try to corner people at meetings to talk with them. Maybe I'll find a group and we'll go have a beer and talk about the latest developments. . . . I'm on _______'s mailing list.

> I learn about research in progress from other people. I find out a lot at conferences talking to old colleagues [that] I don't find out around here. . . . I learn about current developments from other people, but particularly from journals and unpublished papers.

---

[12] Lily Ouyang and Belver Griffith, A preliminary interview study of scientifically and scholarly active linguists (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, LINCS #9-69P, 1969).

Reliance on unpublished papers, however, leads to problems:

> It's a bad situation that it is very hard to get unpublished papers. . . . I've had to exert considerable effort to get these things, and it's all been on my own. There's no real service available. It also gets kind of embarrassing when you have to keep pestering your friends to send you things. You get tired of bothering them.

A solution proposed by one linguist was:

> I think maybe I'll get acquainted with one of _______'s students this summer and get plugged into the pipeline that way.

It was apparent that research in progress was of interest to almost all linguists. For the most part they learned about it by word of mouth, frequently at national meetings where friends met and discussed their work. From there it passed through the grapevine to other colleagues, both local and non-local. In this regard, only two linguists mentioned the use of the CAL publication Language Research in Progress.

6.2. Language Teachers.

The category of language teachers refers to persons whose primary work activity involved the teaching of language; it included administrators, consultants, and others who carried out functions supporting classroom teachers. In this group were most teachers of French, German, Spanish, ESOL, and English as a Native Language, as well as a number of teachers of Russian, Italian, and Portuguese; few persons dealing with the exotic languages were included because these languages are usually taught as a side activity by the scholars and researchers.

Despite the variety of places of employment and the wide range of work activities, the information needs and interests of language teachers were similar. They shared the single immediate goal of teaching language effectively in the classroom, which led to a preoccupation with certain types of information to the exclusion of others.

The principal interests of the language teachers interviewed were teaching methodology, teaching materials, and, to a lesser extent, analysis and discussion of the language taught. They were not especially concerned with theoretical principles of pedagogy. For them methodology meant concrete ideas on handling specific classroom problems. Indicative of the similarity of information needs of language teachers, whatever their work activity, were the following comments.

A teacher responsible for a college course in foreign language teaching methodology:

> I keep in touch with exactly what is going on in the classroom. There is nothing abstract about my work. . . . I don't like theory at all, I guess I don't have the proper mentality or something. I'm very practical because this is what the students want. Things have to be relevant to them.

A public school administrator:

> Our teachers work with reality every day. Every day the children come with their skills and with their deficits. Our responsibility is to help the teachers be effective as they work with children.

An educational consultant:

> We're concerned with what works. Since it's basic ________ [a language] we're concerned with, it's not as though we're involved in semantic problems or great grammatical or linguistic difficulties. We're concerned with getting it across to the fastest and slowest students.

A public school administrator:

> Our concerns are really the practical ones, how to get it across in the most interesting and constructive way possible. We want the youngsters to do well on College Boards and contests. It's the practical concerns every time: how do you handle this particular construction and how do you get that livened up so that the youngsters will like it and learn it? We aren't much interested in things like the incidence of occurrence of this word in that study.

Because language teachers as a whole had similar information needs, they used similar sources of information. For teaching methodology, the primary source of information was the teachers' own experience and that of other teachers. Those who were responsible for determining the methodology to be employed in an institution might go to the literature for ideas, but this was usually only a beginning. Typical comments were these.

An educational consultant.

> We get this type of information mainly out of empirical testing in the classroom. We can get information out of books and discussions and consultants, but then we have to try it. It's been my experience that since there are forty kids in a classroom there are forty, or at least thirty, different reactions to what's going on. A person may have a method that works fine for ninety out of a hundred kids, but what about the other ten? We have to find out how to get it across to them.

An administrator at a private language school:

> The problems of grammar that may come up in discussions with teachers are often problems of presentation. People will get excited about terminology. The question is how to present it. Do they want the students to learn descriptive terminology or not? . . . What amount of drill should be used? Should these constructions be presented in this particular sequence? What is the easiest and most effective

> way to teach the causative? Active or passive first? . . . We get this information from other institutions to an extent. We get a surprising lot of information from teacher applicants. . . . Our own teachers also contribute a lot from their diverse backgrounds.

An administrator at another private language school:

> In methodology we're usually concerned more with practical types of things. I read anything concerned with little things like how to handle reading, writing, dictation in the classroom, phonology, pronunciation. . . . In the area of techniques . . . it's mostly personal knowledge and discussions among the staff.

As an additional source of information on developments in teaching methods, teachers mentioned the meetings and journals of their professional organizations, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Association for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. Two teachers and a consultant said:

> Current developments? Foreign Language Annals. Its bibliography is the most current thing.[13]

> The best source is conferences. The Georgetown Round Table, for example. All the things presented there had some bearing on things at Chicago [the TESOL meeting]. I began to see the whole surge of interest in various directions. There are publications, but when you get loads of speakers all hitting on one topic, it hits you.

> That particular bibliography [in Foreign Language Annals] is almost mandatory if you're to keep up with what's being done.

---

[13] The bibliography covers applied linguistics; physiology and psychology of language learning; analyses and teaching of the cultural and cross-cultural contexts; teaching the foreign literature; curricular problems and developments; teacher education and qualifications; materials and equipment; methods; testing. Articles on linguistics and the grammar of specific languages are included only under the first heading.

The second major interest among the language teachers interviewed was teaching materials. In some cases, of course, materials were chosen in advance by administrators and other teachers. Those having a voice in materials selection usually learned about them from publishers or from colleagues. For evaluation of materials they turned to their colleagues or, to a lesser extent, to reviews in professional journals. Most, like the public school administrator quoted below, reported no difficulty at all in this area:

> We have no trouble getting this information. We have a continuous dialogue with the producers of everything from chalk on up. The best source is this. If I'm looking for something, I'll likely find it in a drawer where I keep their promotional materials; if not there, I can get it in the yellow pages.

A teacher reported:

> We're constantly getting new texts and looking at them. . . . Everyone on the staff, especially ________, reads new lists of books coming out. If there's anything we're interested in, we get a copy of it and read it and discuss it. . . . We look over books we don't use ourselves and talk about things like this: this book has exercises on modal verbs or cross-references made out for different grammatical problems. We do a lot just by talking about it.

For language teachers the problem, if one existed, was not the acquisition of information on existing materials but rather the non-existence of needed materials, such as supplementary ones or advanced-level ones. A teacher noted:

> We need more visual aids that can be used,given that the student can't go abroad, that are culturally authentic to be used in an integral way with texts. There's a tremendous need for something fairly inexpensive this way. . . . For example, ________ [a professional organization] put out a set of cultural units . . . it was advertised in ________ [a journal]. By the time I wrote to them they had the thing booked for the whole year. . . . I don't have the problem of finding out about these things. . . . I keep abreast of them.

Another teacher said:

> I have a great problem finding materials. There is no second year course in ________ [a language]. It doesn't exist. . . . It is very hard to get newspapers and when you go

> to slightly more specialized materials [specialized in subject matter] you can't find it. . . . I'm on the mailing list of all the publishers and I go regularly to the conventions, so I'd know if it came out.

Some language teachers were interested in the analysis of the language taught but usually only as it related to teaching problems. They sought such information in reference books and in discussion with colleagues:

> The information I look for is almost always in terms of methodology rather than new grammatical descriptions. Because my prime concern is what goes on in the classroom, new grammatical descriptions aren't any good since you can't dish them out to the students.

Two teachers, one a non-native speaker and the other a native speaker of the languages taught, said:

> As a non-native speaker I'd speak to ________ or anyone who is around who is a native speaker. There are certain structures that you have to discuss, that you would discuss anyway. You go to a native speaker for the final say: 'it sounds right'.

> In preparing for class . . . I go over the standard grammars sometimes for the more difficult constructions, things that don't show up in the English texts. I might even go into the philologists for problems like describing impersonal es. . . . I'm also interested in comparative structure, especially if I run into a reaction. . . . I get information from texts, sometimes from native ________ grammars, the Northeast Conference, otherwise a study by ________ with helpful hints on how to deal with English speakers. It's hard for me to understand the English speaker's difficulties in some matters, for example, case.

As noted earlier, the places of employment of language teachers interviewed varied widely. Some language teachers worked in language schools, others in universities, and still others in or with public schools. The particular working situation of each of these groups is discussed below in relation to their specific information needs and problems.

6.2.1. Language School Teachers. These schools may be run by private firms, by universities, or by the government, but they all have the same reason for being: to teach adults to understand, speak, read, and write foreign languages. In support of this purpose, rather than as an end in itself, they frequently produce their own materials.

In these schools native language instructors, including Americans where the subject-language is English, teach under the supervision of people, usually Americans, with experience and/or advanced training in language teaching. The native language instructors interviewed were told by their supervisors which basic materials and methodology they were to use. They had some voice in the selection of supplementary materials and of techniques to be used in the actual classroom situation. They obtained supplementary materials from various foreign language publications, which were readily available. For teaching techniques they relied on their own experience and judgment, sometimes on discussions with other instructors, and less frequently on their supervisors. Their use of professional literature was minimal; it was limited usually to native language grammars from their own countries and to dictionaries. As one said:

> Yes, I sometimes look for information, constructions, the contrast or parallel situation with English. I don't think this will be found, it's possible, but I don't think so, in a library. The best way to find it is to study the situation of the class and prepare materials for it.

None reported problems in obtaining information.

Several interview subjects from language schools were in administrative positions entailing some responsibility for choosing materials and methodology. (This category happens to include all those interviewees working with languages of which they were not native speakers.) An additional task was the training of staff, which required devising teacher-training materials. This was done in-house; it reflected the experience and training of the staff and was tailored to the requirements of the individual school. Another area of concern was testing; two people reported problems in finding tests appropriate to their own set-up. One mentioned that she thought that there were tests and materials they did not know about.

In general, the needs of the language schools seemed somewhat idiosyncratic, stemming, as they did, from their differing teaching systems. The commercial schools in particular might have most in common with one another, but since they are in competition they rarely communicate with each other.

6.2.2. University Language Teachers. These teachers, unlike their counterparts at other kinds of institutions, worked in a setting where language teaching was often regarded as secondary to the teaching and study of literature. (See Appendix D for the selection of journals by foreign language specialists.) Language teaching is frequently assigned to faculty members who would much rather teach literature and whose research efforts are directed to it. Faculty members interested in careers in language teaching may have difficulty advancing and may have little contact with or support from others in their department.

A linguist who has worked with language teachers commented that he was disturbed by:

> . . . the general university attitude toward language teaching: as a profession it's viewed as something between buildings and grounds and the actual faculty. . . . The elementary language courses, which are the linguistic ones (English as a Native Language, TEFL, elementary foreign languages), are taught by the most junior people on the staff. They usually don't want to teach these courses and they aren't equipped to do so. . . .

A teacher, a woman, said:

> Occasionally I teach a literature course, but the department has two young men and they are usually given the opportunity for the literature courses. The real money is in literature teaching, of course. . . . The business of the position of the language teacher as lacking in prestige affects everything. The problem is that you don't get the backing of your colleagues. Pretty soon the students know they don't have to take someone [the language teacher] too seriously. This makes advanced teaching very difficult. . . . The advanced students don't want to be correct [in using the language] but to be bright and perceptive. . . . They want to look for symbolism. That's very popular nowadays.

Another teacher:

> I don't really talk much with other people in the department about methodology. Most of them are doing literature. For second-year ________ [a language] I use my own judgement.

The teachers interviewed were all oriented toward teaching language rather than literature, literature specialists having been excluded from the sample. Several were asked how they went about preparing for class sessions, in particular the sources of information they consulted. The answer was generally that they went over the materials to be covered carefully, looked for problems, and adjusted the materials accordingly. A few mentioned consulting reference grammars, texts, and dictionaries:

> You just look at a lesson which isn't the way you'd want it, eliminate the bad items, and figure out how to get good ones. . . . Most lessons and exercises are full of confusion, and you have to alleviate that. . . . I don't need to consult anything on that. You know from experience what will confuse the students.

> I use ________ [a textbook]. I go over the drills. You can't go in cold because the drills are sophisticated. Also, it's a new book with certain errors and ambiguities. I have to go to dictionaries sometimes, although not often because of the glossaries at the backs of books. I often use ________ [a grammar] as a reference book. This is my authority on grammatical structures.

6.2.3. Public School Language Teachers. The interviewees in this group were either consultants or administrators. They supplied some information about teachers as well as themselves.

The teachers at public schools, like those at language schools, had basic materials and methodology prescribed for them. Basic texts and curricula were usually kept uniform, and teachers used only materials on an approved list. Supervisors, assisted by committees of teachers, made up the lists, and individual teachers could suggest items for inclusion. There was no shortage of materials available and no lack of awareness of them, thanks to the promotional efforts of the publishers. While basic methodology was prescribed, teachers usually learned about actual classroom techniques at meetings and workshops, and on other occasions where they traded advice and experience.

Public school administrators mentioned three information problem areas. The first was new or undeveloped areas of language teaching, like programmed learning:

> The place where we aren't as fully informed as we would like to be is areas which haven't really been developed. We can get the ordinary ourselves, but we need the new and the extra-ordinary. . . . We need to know about good programmed learning. We've seen some stuff, the market

> is flooded, but the only one which has been carefully worked out is ________'s, and that's expensive and may not be right for high school.

The second area was classroom application of the findings of linguistics. In one case supervisors were eager to get good materials in basic linguistics for the benefit of the teachers:

> English linguistics is the area where we have a problem. The material is written for people with some background. There's very little on the teacher's level. . . . The curriculum committee can't write the new curriculum without some reference to this new movement in teaching language which is heavily influenced by transformational grammar.

As this person indicated, the problem here is with non-existent materials.

The third problem area was materials and techniques for teaching standard English to speakers of foreign languages and non-standard dialects. Programs in this field, which is a new one for most of the public school personnel involved, are likely to be small.

6.3. Researchers in Other Fields

Information problems of many of the researchers in other fields involved coverage of general developments in their field, inaccessibility of technical reports, and inadequate research in progress services. These problems were often resolved through informal means. It should be noted that the problems thus solved were in the researcher's principal field of activity, not the related fields. Evidence does not permit many generalizations, but the following observations may make the information needs and activities of some of these researchers clearer.

6.3.1. Speech. The three people interviewed, all senior members of the field, agreed that speech as a discipline draws heavily on certain other fields, principally special education, psychology, and medicine. The necessity to cover sources in these other fields in addition to their own was a real problem.

> For three or four years we have turned to the master's thesis called the annotated bibliography based on a review of 300 articles on a specified subject. . . . We find that that search takes them through 65 to 75 journals which I haven't an earthly chance of reading as a teacher. . . . We do have our finger in almost all phases of medicine (except dying). Medicine, education, psychology, and rehabilitation, I'd say. . . . Coverage of a broad spectrum of sources is a very strong need. It scares me to death; people are reading something in their own journals about my field. For example, any new development in cleft palate would be of very much interest to me and it might not be in my own journal. . . .

6.3.2. Psychology. The four research psychologists interviewed dealt with foreign languages or language teaching directly. Yet they rarely used sources in linguistics or foreign languages, except for consultation with native speakers of the languages with which they worked and with linguists who were either co-workers or consultants.

> The language I would need most would be ________, but I have no knowledge of it. . . . Everything goes through words, through language, but the object isn't to study language for its own sake but as a vehicle of communication and organizing of the environment. My interest isn't linguistic but psychological.

> I work closely with ________, who is a psycholinguist with a linguistics background. . . . In the area of linguistics and psycholinguistics we have a lot of questions. We had a fellow in consulting on ________[a language] this morning. . . . I read the books by the people who are sort of psychologists. Harris, Chomsky, etc., would be the concern of ________. . . . There are a few psycholinguistic journals, but ________ reads these and I rely on him to look that over.

6.3.3. Mathematics. Although mathematical and computational linguistics are branches of linguistics rather than mathematics, mathematicians work in these areas. One mathematician described the effort put into keeping up with the literature in this area:

> We use reprints a lot. We request them like crazy. We even have a card to fill in that we use in getting them. We have an organized system for scouring the literature. . . .

> Students do the scanning. They xerox tables of contents and mark the titles, and then I doublecheck them. We cover all the computer science journals, four or five math journals, eight linguistics journals and about four information science journals. I tell the students to look for certain topics, key words and titles. This is an active system, not a passive one.

He also mentioned a difficulty:

> The journal literature is slow, but high quality papers appear only in refereed journals. If you want things in a hurry you have to know people and get xeroxes of drafts. ________ does a lot of this because he knows people. He's one source where I get things.

6.4. Specialists in the Exotic Languages.

Linguists specializing in exotic languages and other professionals with this specialty, such as foreign language specialists and anthropologists, share some of the same characteristics. In the field of exotic languages the quantity of research in progress and publication is small and hence relatively easy to follow. Moreover, it is often the case that most specialists in a given exotic language, linguists and non-linguists alike, know and communicate with each other.

Interview subjects in the commonly taught languages restricted their society membership, meeting attendance, journal reading, use of other published sources, and professional contacts almost entirely to those concerning the language in which they specialized. Exceptions involved sources of information on educational methodology and occasional personal contact with linguists or psychologists. The exotic language specialists, both linguists and non-linguists, described a wider variety of society memberships, meetings, published sources, and contacts. The fields of greatest interest to exotic language specialists were linguistics, anthropology, and area studies. In the questionnaire and interview samples a majority of the non-linguists who specialized in the exotic languages expressed a particular interest in linguistics as it touched on their language of specialization, while only a relatively small percentage of those in the commonly taught languages did so.

Exotic language specialists interviewed encountered three principal types of information problems, problems rarely if ever mentioned by specialists in the commonly taught languages. One was lack of appropriate teaching materials; sometimes not even a first year text was available. A linguist who prepared teaching materials:

> I work with an informant to generate the kind of information that's needed for pedagogical purposes. In both languages that I'm working on there's a fair amount of grammatical and phonological information available but not in the form that lends itself to immediate pedagogical usage. One sort of has to translate out of this reference material.

A teacher:

> Yesterday we talked about a particular kind of compound formation in _______ [an exotic language]. . . . These are things that no one writes about. The literature hasn't begun to scratch the surface. . . . I don't look for methodological information about _______. I'm after someone's theoretical ideas about a particular aspect of _______ that I can translate into something for my students. I'm interested in how someone else might teach it, but there isn't much information on that. So I look for how someone else views the problem itself, then make up my own way for teaching.

Another problem was difficulty in obtaining factual information, particularly when native informants were unavailable:

> Times when I couldn't find information I needed? Sure, lots of them. For example, right now I have a map with place names located by the informants and through carelessness they didn't pinpoint a number of them. I can't do it without going to _______ [a distant place] or bringing an informant here. That's the kind of thing I run into, answers to questions with no informant at hand. It's not in any source in the literature.

The third type of problem arose from the inaccessibility of important reference grammars and dictionaries. Often such books were out of print; some were quite rare; and some were available only from foreign sources. Hence, scholars often watched carefully for them, browsing through esoteric bookstores and booksellers' catalogs:

> My own work has been hampered many times because they couldn't get a certain work, it was out of print.
>
> You have to see what's available and buy what you think will be useful, instead of starting out with specific ideas. . . . It's terrible to have an urgent need for a specific item. When you're trying to build up a working library you don't wait for what you want specifically but pick up available items.

Asked about a time when he had trouble obtaining information, one scholar related the following tale:

> Yes. The great ________ Dictionary. We were beginning to think it was a myth. ________ said it was available to his collaborators, although not to him. We hunted for it for years and years. No one had ever seen a copy. No one in the U.S., not in the British Library, or the Bibliotheque Nationale, nobody had one. Then one day a girl who has worked on our project who is a student at ________ attended a lecture there given by ________. After the talk there was a social session and she talked to the man who gave the lecture. She mentioned that she was working on this project, and he said he had some sort of old ________ dictionary: would she like to see it. He had never really used it. . . . It was the ________ published in Algiers in 1917, which is why it didn't get to the Bibliotheque Nationale. We had a microfilm made of it and six prints. It's a magnificent work.

6.5. Informal Communication

An analysis of interview data on informal communication revealed some of the kinds of relationships existing among colleagues as well as the topics most often discussed. Colleagues mentioned by each person were classified as immediate (those at the same institution), local (those at other institutions in the Washington area), and out of town. Paid consultants constituted a fourth category.

Groups of immediate colleagues varied so widely in size, structure, and composition that no meaningful generalizations on these topics could be formulated. While most interview subjects reported exchanging information with their immediate colleagues, those who had little communication with them were either alone in their field at a given institution or differed in orientation or interests from their colleagues within the general field, or else were not personally inclined to such information exchange. A few cited lack of time as a barrier to informal communication; many in the first two situations described above said they turned to colleagues outside their own institutions.

On the local level, language professionals seemed to be divided into a number of basically separate communities and sub-communities defined by major field, subject specialty, and/or work activity. Within each work community there was a group of people who communicated with each other professionally. Certain individuals belonged to more than one group and acted as a link between them. There were also individuals who did not belong to any particular local group, although they had individual local associations. This was the exception.

Some local groups seemed to be subdivisions of similar national or even international groups. One such group was the managerial linguists,[14] the linguists and language teaching professionals who held various administrative positions in the federal government, universities, and private institutions. Another group consisted of fairly well-established, experienced, local linguists, also in the government, universities, and private institutions, who shared a general interest in linguistics. Like the managerial linguists most of them knew each other and kept in communication via telephone and meetings, both formal and informal. Certain individuals within this group were regarded, both in and out of it, as experts and were consulted fairly regularly. Smaller groups of linguists in certain subject areas formed their own circles. The sociolinguists, specialists in speech perception, and computational linguists were examples.

Other groups centered around specific language interests. Specialists in certain exotic languages, such as linguists, language specialists, anthropologists, and area studies experts, constituted such groups, which were, of course, very small. In the commonly taught languages there seemed to be different groups in each language, perhaps subdivided into high school teachers, college and university teachers, and scholars and literature specialists. Data on this subject were too sparse to permit definite statements. There was at least one group of ESOL specialists working in the government, universities, and private non-profit institutions; those at commercial language schools seemed to remain apart. One other group revealed by the study consists of foreign language teachers and administrators sharing a general concern with foreign language education, especially its practical aspects.

---

[14] See page 45.

In general, interviews with professionals in fields outside of languages and linguistics indicated that their principal local associations were with others in their own discipline. Most of those interviewed had associations with only a few people in languages and linguistics. Too few were interviewed, however, to permit specification of local groups within the fields touched on.

A number of factors facilitated communication among local people from different institutions. Three which were formalized were meetings of institutional representatives, such as the Interagency Round Table; meetings of local professional groups, such as the Washington Linguistics Club, and the Greater Washington Association of Teachers of Foreign Languages; and arranged visits to other institutions. The study revealed three other facilitating factors. About fifteen interviewees, employed full-time at various institutions were enrolled as part-time students in, or were recent graduates of, local universities, and had thus met others in the same subject area. Almost one-fourth of those interviewed had previously held positions at other Washington institutions and had continued their contacts. There were a number of married professional couples working or studying at different institutions.

Communication with out of town colleagues seemed to follow one of two patterns, depending upon the level of the individuals involved. In the case of the full-fledged scholars and researchers (information producers), Ph.D.'s for the most part, out of town colleagues were usually part of what seemed to be invisible colleges and reference groups. Their informal communication was of the type described for active linguists and linguists in esoteric specialties. The groups were relatively well-defined as to subject area and participants.

This pattern of communication contrasted with that of the more junior people (information users). This category included not only most linguists, reading specialists, etc., at the bachelor's or master's level, but also the language teachers. While many had friends and contacts from elsewhere with whom they exchanged information by correspondence or discussions at meetings, they did not seem to occupy places in any definable group. Informal communication was more a matter of individuals' happening to know other individuals. Also, for the majority of this category, those involved with language teaching, the subjects of discussion were usually teaching techniques, trends, and materials rather than the theories, data, research in progress, research methodology, and interpretation of research results of the information producers.

Paid consultants were considered separately on the grounds that informal communication in other situations was relatively spontaneous, while consultation formalized the process of giving information and advice. Among the people interviewed consultation played a fairly important role in information exchange. Several were full-time consultants, others part-time. Subjects reported hiring consultants for such varied purposes as setting up a program, advising on and evaluating programs and research under way, providing information on current developments in the client's own area, and providing information on a different area. Professionals at all levels, including researchers, hired consultants when they needed expert help. Acting as a consultant facilitated informal communication for several interviewees. It brought them into contact not only with individuals working on the projects for which they were engaged, but also with other consultants and experts in the same area. Moreover, it required them to keep up with the latest research findings when provision of current awareness was included in the consultation agreement.

Although topics of discussion in informal communication varied widely among interview subjects, most could be classified into several, perhaps overlapping, general categories. Almost everyone reported discussing various aspects of their own work, especially with their immediate colleagues, whether or not they worked closely with them. These discussions involved all the other topics mentioned below, such as specific problems, journal articles related to the work, etc.

Many of the reported instances of informal communication involved consulting an expert on specific problems. Active researchers consulted experts on problems out of their own area of expertise, while others required assistance on problems in their own areas as well, sometimes because of lack of training and/or experience. The experts consulted were sometimes more experienced or better trained people at the same institution, but were more often outside colleagues or paid consultants.

In other instances professionals reported acting as experts themselves, sometimes as resource or staff development personnel assigned this responsibility in their institutions, sometimes as experts who happened to be in residence. The latter was frequently the case in universities. Those who acted as experts outside their own institutions were of two types: the active researcher who was called upon to be a guest lecturer, a paid consultant, a member of a task force, or a reference source for those who knew him and could call or write to him; and the full-time professional consultant who was paid not only to apply his own knowledge and ability but also to bring in other experts and expert opinion. The latter, while not usually an active researcher, shared with him the opportunities for informal communication arising out of their roles as experts.

Other frequently reported subjects of informal communication were: current developments in one's field; research in progress (mainly a concern of researchers); the literature of a field, both in general and in relation to specific problems; and information about people and programs. Personnel and program information was important to researchers and teachers as well as administrators when they needed an expert in a particular area or desired certain services that other institutions offered.

Many interviewees reported that informal communication was a preferred, or at least a most frequently used, source of information on most of these topics. In any event, it certainly complemented published sources and filled needs the latter could not or did not.

7. The Reaction to and Use of Some Specialized Information Services and Media

7.1. Technical Reports

Linguists and researchers in other fields who were interviewed reported considerable use of technical reports, but language teachers and language scholars did not. Questionnaire respondents in other fields rated them as important more frequently than did linguists or foreign language specialists. In connection with technical reports, interview subjects mentioned difficulty in finding out what reports were available and in obtaining copies, problems applicable to any unpublished report.

A researcher in special education:

> They are very difficult to get hold of. . . . They're relatively low on my priority list but I recognize that they shouldn't be. . . . It's quite possible that the difficulty in getting what I want has turned me off from wanting to use them.

A linguist:

> I don't get access to things like the _______ reports. I'd very much like to, though. I'm really not sure what else I might like to see because I feel I'm not aware of a lot.

Those who used technical reports also had problems. A man in speech perception:

> They're very good, but I always seem to get the wrong ones. I'm on various people's mailing lists and they send me things they think I might be interested in. . . . They're an important source of information; they often appear a couple of years before the finished publication. The trouble is that it's hard to find out what's available. Many seem to appear in catalogs without any classification. One finds out only by accident what's available.

A linguist:

> I was working on _______. There are publications on the subject put out by _______, available only in general

We get the literature, but it's a sad commentary; we need some way of screening. I don't really use it. We need to have someone who is ERIC-oriented working with ERIC material because we're so involved in so much, we can't take the time to do the job that needs to be done.

A linguist:

ERIC? I just got something from the Center [the CAL ERIC Clearinghouse announcement]. . . . What's in it seems to be randomly selected. . . . Does ERIC take anything that comes along? They should have a committee of people with good taste. This thing is useless. . . . They should at least categorize the stuff. I wouldn't go through all that to find out whether there was anything in it I was interested in.

Another linguist:

It's a world to study in itself. They aren't telling me what I want to know. It's too broad. You have to go through too much and waste time and you still don't know what's been said, at least for my purposes. I never took an ERIC thing and followed it through.

A speech pathologist:

We have used it, unsuccessfully. Part of it is that we aren't of any one discipline. . . . ERIC has a bias toward special education. There's a lot of stuff in there that I think is junk, it wouldn't be to other people and must have meaning to them, but there's a lot of stuff to wade through to get to what's important. But ERIC doesn't abstract medical journals well if at all. It goes back to the idea that special education has about speech pathology and audiology and not worrying about the medical aspects. If we try to use medical abstracting services then we have to wade through a lot of medical junk and they don't abstract education or psychology journals well . . . I ordered the ERIC handbook. I spent two hours going through it and sent it back where I got it. I've never really used it. . . . It isn't worth the effort. I didn't see what it provided that dsh Abstracts didn't, except there was less time lag.

Note the circumstances of a linguist who was an enthusiastic user:

I use every ERIC that comes out. I go through it with the help of an assistant. I pick out the titles I'm interested

> in,,xerox all the summaries, then again go through them and order everything I think I want. This work is pretty much done by assistants. This makes a big difference. It's nothing I could do when I was teaching, because of the lack of clerical assistance.

The problem seems to be the time required to get desirable results.

7.3. Abstracts

Abstracts were not rated as an important source of information by many linguists or foreign language specialists who returned the questionnaire. A higher percentage in the other fields rated them as important. The difference may stem from the very limited number of abstract journals in the language sciences.

Interview subjects had mixed reactions. Some liked them.

A linguist:

> If they are available I look at them. . . . It saves your going to the materials themselves only to find that they aren't what you wanted after all. They can be very efficient.

Some did not use them often.

Another linguist:

> I read them if they're available . . . I tried the LLBA Abstracts a couple of times and couldn't find exactly what I wanted, so I gave it up. I don't find them very useful. Usually by the time you track down the abstract you might as well have gotten the original and read it. It's difficult to find them. It might be more useful if it were less effort.

People also reported different ways of using abstracts. Some used them as a bibliographical tool only.

Two linguists:

> There's not much information in an abstract; it tells you if you want to read the article, a bibliographic tool and nothing more. The only abstracts I use regularly are

> those summarizing the literature in languages I don't know, like Russian. I'd settle for an abstract when I don't have the article. I do like things that begin or end with them.
>
> I use the abstracts I can get . . . If I find what's in them interesting I wouldn't just go on that. I don't trust them that far. I go to the article itself.

Others used them as a source of substantive information.

A linguist:

> The LLBA Abstracts are excellent. They're very useful. I use them as an actual source of information. There are things I wouldn't want to read all the way through, like psycholinguistic stuff. It's nice to have a lot of things summarized.

7.4. Bibliographies

Most interview subjects mentioned using bibliographies at least occasionally, there were, however, several exceptions. Some people did not seek bibliographic information from published sources, but relied on colleagues instead. Where well-annotated bibliographies were not available, some individuals would not accept anything less. Most people questioned on the subject said they much preferred annotated bibliographies.

A linguist:

> I've had the experience of finding things when tracing down a certain topic, say in the Linguistic Bibliography and I've made a list of X number of articles that look good only to find out that they were better forgotten. It would be nice to have at least a few word evaluation or statement of what the article deals with, what kind of orientation it has.

A linguist:

> A bibliography should contain basic information about each work and then if there were some way of indicating the major emphasis of the work, that would be the most helpful thing.

The idea of evaluation in bibliographies was much more controversial. Those who liked the idea tended to be junior people who felt that they needed expert guidance. Most were skeptical, especially those with more experience. A reading specialist:

> Evaluation? It depends on who's doing it. If it's someone who you know is good in research, and not some graduate student, fine. . . .

And the terse comment of a linguist:

> Well, if we have at the beginning an evaluation of the evaluator, it might work.

Quite a number maintained their own bibliographies and card files where they kept notations of articles they had come across on particular topics.

7.5. Libraries

Comments on libraries tended to be negative, mainly because of the inconvenience of using them. At libraries other than those in the user's own institution, books must be consulted on the premises.

A linguist who works on exotic languages:

> There's a big list of things at the ________ library I'd like to see. But it's a big effort to go over there and once you're there you have to wait to get the books and then you have to use them there. If the book has worthwhile stuff in it, I'd rather xerox it and mark it up. But I can't check the books out and I can't xerox them there.

Most interviewees preferred buying books for themselves if possible. Two linguists:

> I own most of what I need or I buy it. I use libraries for what I can't buy, because it's out of print. Nothing up to date.
>
> It so costly to use libraries. Since it takes so long to find what you want you might as well buy it and not be wasting time.

7.6. Ads and Catalogs

For some interviewees, especially language teachers, promotional material put out by commercial publishers and booksellers was an important secondary source, and several people mentioned keeping files of such materials.

8. Cross-Disciplinary Interests of Language Professionals

8.1. Linguists

Many linguists had ties with disciplines outside linguistics, the most notable being the various foreign language disciplines (see table 14). Many specialized in the teaching of languages and sometimes in literature as well. Of sixty linguists in the questionnaire study, forty-three reported a special interest in one or more foreign languages; of twenty-six in the interview study, nineteen reported a similar special interest. Twenty-four of the forty-three linguists in the questionnaire study and twelve of the nineteen in the interview study said they had a special interest in the linguistics of a particular language.

Linguists concerned with English included both those who specialized in ESOL (and were thus associated with the foreign language group), and those who did not. A few linguists specialized in teaching English as a native language and had experience in various areas of education.

In addition to their foreign language interests, some linguists reported special concern with various cross-disciplinary areas; frequently mentioned were psycholinguistics, anthropological linguistics, computational linguistics, and sociolinguistics. In table 30 these were grouped under linguistics because interviews and other discussions indicated that these specialties, when pursued by a linguist, were pursued from the theoretical orientation of linguistics as distinct from that of the other discipline involved. The number of disciplines with which linguistics overlapped might be somewhat misleading, however, in terms of the number of people involved; according to table 30, the number of Washington linguists with cross-disciplinary interests was rather small compared to those with interests in foreign languages and within the field of linguistics.

On the other hand, the answers to a questionnaire item asking respondents to rate the importance of various fields as sources of information indicated widespread interest in many other fields.

Table 30. Number of Linguists by Special Interest Types

Special Interest Types	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Linguistics	55	26
General linguistics	41	22
Linguistics of a language	24	12
Linguistics and literature	1	-
Psycholinguistics	8	3
Anthropological linguistics	2	-
Computational linguistics	4	6
Sociolinguistics	9	2
Foreign languages	43	19
Unspecified foreign language	4	7
ESOL	17	6
Commonly taught foreign language	16	4
Slavic language	1	-
Exotic language	14	8
English	1	-
Education	3	-
Total responding	60	26

Table 31. Number of Linguists by Fields Rated Important Sources of Information

Fields Rated Important Sources of Information	Questionnaire Respondents
Linguistics	37
Scholarship of a particular language or language family	32
Foreign language teaching methodology	25
Psychology	22
ESOL	20
English	17
Anthropology	16
Sociology	16
Education	15
Speech pathology	10
Total responding	38

Source: D. C. Questionnaire Survey

Table 31 contains a list of fields which ten or more linguists out of thirty-eight rated as important. Linguistics, of course, headed the list. Various language fields, confirming other evidence, were also rated very highly. However, the large number of responding linguists who indicated that psychology, sociology, and speech pathology were important to them was not paralleled for the most part by a large number reporting that they read journals or books or attended meetings in these fields. (See Section 5.)

In terms of expressed interest in other disciplines, then, the linguists were characterized by a very high degree of foreign language interest and a wide range of expressed interest in other fields combined with a relatively modest amount of information seeking in them.

8.2. Foreign Language Specialists

Table 32 shows the types of special interests cited by foreign language specialists in the interview sample. All had foreign language interests, some in specific languages, some in foreign languages generally, and some in language teaching methodology. Approximately 30% of the questionnaire respondents and almost half of the interview subjects reported a special interest in some portion of the field of linguistics. In most cases it was in the linguistic analysis of their specialty, or its lexicography and etymology; such interests were more common among persons in the exotic languages. Only a very few (three out of sixty-two in the questionnaire sample and three out of twenty-two in the interview group) indicated a special interest in applied linguistics per se (in this case the linguistically-oriented methodology of language teaching).

Table 33 tabulates replies to the questionnaire item on rating the importance of various fields as sources of information. As might be expected, respondents regarded the scholarship of particular languages, methodology of foreign language teaching, and the field of education as important sources of information. Interestingly, twenty-seven out of thirty-four rated the field of linguistics as important, although only eighteen out of the entire sample had indicated any specialized interest in linguistics; and even fewer belonged to linguistics societies, attended linguistics meetings, or requested linguistics coverage in a current-awareness service.

Table 32. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Special Interest Types

Special Interest Types	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Foreign languages		
Own language field	58	17[a]
ESOL	7	7
Commonly taught foreign language	33	5
Italian	-	1
Russian	8	-
Classical language	5	-
Exotic language	6	4
Foreign languages not own language field	9	5
Unspecified foreign language	5	3
Other foreign language (commonly taught, etc.)	6	3
Linguistics and related specialties	18	9
Applied linguistics	3	3
Structure of specialty language	11	5
Lexicography, lexicology	3	1
Other	1	-
Other	1	2
Total responding	62	22

[a] This figure does not include those identified not with a particular language but with general foreign language teaching research and other activities.

Table 33. Number of Foreign Language Specialists by Fields Rated Important Sources of Information

Fields Rated Important Sources of Information	Questionnaire Respondents
Foreign language teaching methodology	28
Scholarship of a particular language or language family	27
English	16
ESOL	15
Linguistics	27
Education	18
Psychology	9
Total responding	34

Source: D.C. Questionnaire Survey

8.3. Professionals in Other Fields

Table 34 presents data on specialized interests of professionals in other fields. Half the questionnaire respondents indicated an interest in aspects of language science outside their own disciplines. Since this group was largely pre-selected as having interests in linguistics or foreign languages (see page 22), it is significant that fully half these people did not indicate these interests. (See C of table 34.) The interview subjects, chosen because of position and availability rather than apparent interest in linguistics, were more randomly selected; only five out of nineteen expressed interest in linguistics or foreign languages. Such interests were limited in scope, and three were interested mainly in foreign languages.

Too few people from a single field responded to the questionnaire item on rating the importance of various fields as sources of information to provide significant results. Linguistics was the only field generally rated highly by people not in it; fourteen out of the twenty-one respondents rated it as important. As in the case of foreign language specialists, this did not tally with other evidence of information use.

Language science professionals outside of linguistics and foreign languages were divided into two groups. The first was educators, teachers and administrators in the fields of English, speech, and reading. A relatively small percentage of the rather large group concerned with education seemed to have interests in areas outside their immediate field such as ESOL and the linguistic analysis of English. Many showed no such interest, and some had negative attitudes.

The second group included researchers in other fields studying language, in some cases for its own sake, and in others as a research tool. People in the latter category had the interests of students, not teachers or scholars, of foreign languages. People in the former category, at least in Washington, were few in number and scattered across various fields of study, including English, speech, education, psychology, anthropology, area studies, mathematics, computer science, and information science. Of this number, some were actively interested in some aspect of linguistics or foreign language scholarship; others were not. The aspects they were interested in varied rather widely with the field involved.

Table 34. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Special Interest Types

	Questionnaire Respondents		Interview Subjects	
A. Special Interest Types				
Within Own Field	31		18	
Outside Own Field	18		5	
B. Fields of Respondents and Special Interests Outside Field				
English	1		-	
Linguistics and Literature		1		-
ESOL		1		-
Speech	2		1	
Applied Linguistics		-	1	
Structure of Black English		1		-
Educational psychology		1		-
Reading		1		-
Psychology	1		1	
Programmed language instruction		-	1	
Education		1	-	
Anthropology	1		1	
Foreign languages		1		1
Education	-		1	
ESOL		-		1
Educational psychology	1		-	
Language testing		1		-
Programmed language instruction		1		-
English education	2		-	
General linguistics		1		-
Structure of Black English		1		-
Sociolinguistics		2		-
ESOL		1		-
Mathematics	1		1	
Computational and mathematical linguistics		1		1
Computer science	3		-	
Mathematical linguistics		1		-
Computational linguistics		2		-
Information science		1		-

Table 34. Number of Professionals in Other Fields by Special Interest Types (Continued)

	Questionnaire Respondents	Interview Subjects
Information science	2	-
Mathematical linguistics	1	-
Computational linguistics	1	-
Statistical linguistics	1	-
Programmed language instruction	1	-
Other	1	-
Area studies	2	-
Foreign languages	2	-
Other	2	-
Sociolinguistics	1	-
Linguistics aspects of law	1	-
Statistical linguistics	1	-
Foreign languages	1	-
C. Summary of Special Interests Outside Field		
Cross-disciplinary areas involving linguistics	11	2
Foreign languages	5	3
Education	3	-
Information science	1	-
Total with special interests in cross-disciplinary areas involving linguistics or foreign languages	14	5
Total responding	36	19

9. Reactions in Other Disciplines to Linguistics

This section deals with the non-quantifiable interview evidence on non-linguists' reactions to linguistics, including positive vs. negative attitudes toward linguistics; awareness vs. non-awareness of it; and ability vs. non-ability to use the findings and the literature of linguistics. Such issues are of importance in determining the likely use and appropriate file structure of an information system like LINCS, with an institutional base in linguistics. The three major groups of non-linguists considered in this analysis were language teachers, language scholars, and researchers in other fields.

9.1. Language Teachers

In addition to language teachers, this group included administrators, consultants, and others concerned directly or indirectly with classroom teaching of French, Spanish, German, ESOL and English as a Native Language. The courses taught were first and second year foreign language courses, or their equivalents, and basic English courses; they were conducted in a wide range of institutions.

The common, overriding concern of language teachers was the effective teaching of individual human beings in classrooms. If linguists were able to contribute to this process, so much the better; however, many language teachers did not think they could. Those who disagreed were frequently taken aback by the form in which they found the contribution. The following quotations are relevant.

A public school administrator:

> We don't get much direct information from the psychologists and the linguists, only to the extent that we attend the Washington Linguistics Club and the Georgetown Round Table, and it's only indirectly that we can apply it. It has to be interpreted through the professional organizations [in foreign language teaching].

Another public school administrator:

> Would this information system [LINCS] furnish things that a teacher could use in the classroom? Would the information

> fed out be something that a teacher could use who wasn't a linguist? So much of this material, you need so much background before you can read it. Someone might need this information, but they need it in a form they can handle.

A private language school administrator:

> Most of applied linguistics is theory. As for the real types of problems we're faced with, I don't know who discusses them. You may find an article on _______ which looks interesting, but then you find that they tried something and it doesn't work. Most of the articles say this, or else say what _______ does, that everything we need is more experimentation. We deal with people. Sometimes we have teachers who do things differently from our methodology and they get results, so we don't bother them.

An educational consultant and language teacher:

> There's always been a linguist at the NDEA summer institutes. When they were going to abolish that requirement, _______ called me up and asked me to fight it. I said, 'Why should I, I'm all for abolishing it! I suppose a good basic course in linguistics is something that everyone in language teaching should have, but beyond that they're just picking at details. Some of the worst teachers I've had have been linguists, because they were so wrapped up in the content and so little concerned with the means of getting it across.

A professional in special education:

> I took applied linguistics . . . and a course in psycholinguistics . . . It was a great help to me . . . but I went to a big conference a while back and there were some linguists there. They had some very interesting theories, but they had some very peculiar ideas about teaching [a certain type of student] or anyone else. They really don't know anything about these applications per se. I concluded that linguistics had a great deal to offer, but linguists don't.

To the language teacher, the linguist frequently seemed to be a head-in-the-clouds theoretician, far removed from real students in real classrooms. His ideas were too abstract. His documents were abstruse, impenetrable, and worse yet, useless. His interference was resented, the more so when his own teaching example was infelicitous. This very negative attitude was not infrequent. Probably more common, however, were language teachers who had no idea what linguistics was.

On the positive side, there were a few language teachers who took to linguistics with great enthusiasm and ultimately took and taught courses in it. More frequent than the enthusiasts were those who took a benign, if somewhat distant, view of linguistics; some of those quoted above had a positive attitude. Almost all mentioned the need for interpretation of the findings of linguistics, for recasting them in a form that teachers could understand and use. This problem is not altogether unrecognized among linguists. One linguist described one of the weaknesses of contrastive analyses as:

> . . . their failure to communicate with their ostensible audience, the language teacher and the student. It is frequently clear that they are actually addressed to the author's fellow linguists: the language is often highly technical, and little direct concern for pedagogical implication is evident; the elegance and ingenuity of the formulation are obviously paramount considerations.

Another linguist said:

> Research findings as educators have seen them, and this is inevitable, relate to findings concerning problems as the scholar stated them, which aren't necessarily the problems of schools. As a result, research findings don't seem to have much application. . . . The people doing the research aren't interested in classroom problems per se. . . . There exists at this point no intermediary. . . . Right now the purpose is served by the writers of materials. Their use of research in a meaningful way is minimal. Materials making ought to be more research-based than it is, but it can't have been because the research is so inaccessible.

He suggested that what teachers need is a kind of cookbook, something that has passed through a level of interpretation, evaluation, and synthesis to become a set of suggestions and instructions; teaching materials, in other words.

An administrator in foreign language teaching suggested the same:

> If publishers will put linguists on their staffs along with teachers, then classroom teachers will have guidance.

This is beginning to happen, of course, but it is still infrequent. There are many materials on the market which are described as linguistic but many teachers seemed to feel that "linguistic" was simply a commercially useful label.

9.2. Language Scholars

This group consisted principally of college and university professors of English and foreign languages whose main work activity, at least in terms of its importance for them, was research. Although they might teach, teaching was a side activity, in which their greatest concern was frequently literature rather than grammar. The scholars in this group whom a LINCS might serve were those with an interest in linguistics; those with language teaching responsibilities; and those concerned with the history, lexicography, and dialects of a language.

Like the language teachers they often had definite attitudes toward linguistics, for example:

> Oh, those linguistics people, they're impossible! They think they know everything about a language without even knowing it because it's in their theories. I had one in here last year. He actually tried to tell me . . . .
>
> I don't know much about linguistics myself and I'm a little too old to start now, but I think it's very important. . . That's why we make our students take a few courses over in the linguistics department. We try to work very closely with them.

With regard to linguistics, the language scholars seemed to fall into two groups: the traditionalists and the linguistically oriented. The traditionalists usually had a background in fields with a long history of grammatical, philological, and literary study. (Since universities still graduate them, they may be young as well as old.) Some knew nothing of linguistics and were neutral toward it, but some were hostile, like the otherwise civil professor known to burst into tirades at the mention of linguistics. The traditionalists had little to do with linguistics materials or sources; for the most part they were not prepared to follow linguistics discussions.

The linguistically oriented scholars, on the other hand, had a positive attitude. Many had taken courses in linguistics and some had majored in it. They used linguistic analyses and worked with linguists on certain problems. As a group they appeared more interested than the traditionalists in problems of language teaching, linguistic analysis of the language, its history, and its dialectology, all the concerns of linguists as well.

9.3. Researchers in Other Fields

This category included the scholars and administrators whose most important work activity focused on research. Like the language scholars, they spent more time teaching, but it was a secondary activity in terms of interest. In the interview sample, most of the people represented were in education, psychology, and speech. The group would also include some in anthropology, area studies, mathematics, computer science, and information science.

In contrast to the groups described in 9.1 and 9.2, researchers in the non-language fields seemed to look upon linguistics as simply another discipline. Some thought it had contributions to make to their work, some did not; most did not think much about it at all. Those who did tended to confine their interest to the particular aspect of linguistics most relevant to their own field.

These researchers had the same kind of difficulty that the language specialists had in trying to use the literature in linguistics: they did not have the necessary background. Many preferred to short-cut the literature and to go directly to linguists with their questions. This was less necessary in questions involving the applications of linguistics to language teaching than in those involving transformational grammar or some language descriptions. With many of the more active researchers, the difficulty lay not in gaining access to the literature of linguistics but in evaluating findings.

One researcher said:

> I can understand an article in linguistics, I have the factual background, but I don't know what the hell it means relative to the rest of the field and don't know how to evaluate it . . . It's just much easier to keep your vest-pocket linguist around.

REFERENCES

Allen, Thomas J. and Stephen I. Cohen. Information Flow in R & D Laboratories. Alfred P. Sloan School of Management Working Paper #217-68. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1968.

Bernard, Jessie, Charles W. Shilling and Joe W. Tyson. Informal Communication Among Bioscientists. Part I, #16-63. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Biological Sciences Communication Project, 1963.

Garvey, William D. and Belver C. Griffith. Reports of the American Psychological Association's Project on Scientific Information Exchange in Psychology. Nos. 1-21. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1963-1968.

Garvey, William D. and Belver C. Griffith. "Scientific Information Exchange in Psychology." Science 146. 1655-1659, 1964.

Herner, Saul and Mary Herner. "Information Needs and Uses in Science and Technology." In: Carlos A. Cuadra, ed., Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (Vol. 2. New York, N.Y.: Interscience Publishers, 1967) 1-34.

Herschman, Arthur. Information Retrieval in Physics. IARD 67-1. New York, N.Y.: American Institute of Physics, Information Analysis and Retrieval Division, 1967.

Joos, Martin. Preface to Readings in Linguistics I. The Development of Descriptive Linguistics in America, 1925-1956. (Martin Joos, ed., 4th ed., Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1966) v-vi.

Libbey, Miles A. and Gerald Zaltman. The Role and Distribution of Written Informal Communication in Theoretical High Energy Physics. Report No. AIP/SDD - 1 (Rev.). New York, N.Y.: American Institute of Physics, Systems Development Division, 1967.

Mead, Robert G., Jr., ed. Language Teaching - Broader Contexts: Reports of the Working Committees. New York, N.Y.: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1966.

Menzel, Herbert. "Information Needs and Uses in Science and Technology." In: Carlos A. Cuadra, ed., Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (Vol. 1. New York, N.Y.: Interscience Publishers, 1966) 41-69.

Mersel, Jules, Joseph C. Donohue and William A. Morris. Information Transfer in Educational Research. TR-66-15-7. Sherman Oaks, Calif.: Informatics, Inc., 1966.

Paisley, William J. "Information Needs and Uses." In: Carlos A. Cuadra, ed., Annual Review of Information Science and Technology (Vol. 3. Chicago, Ill.: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1968) 1-30.

Paisley, William J. and Edwin B. Parker. Scientific Information Exchange at an Interdisciplinary Behavioral Science Convention. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University, Institute for Communication Research, 1967.

Rosenberg, Victor. "The Application of Psychometric Techniques to Determine the Attitudes of Individuals Toward Information Seeking." In: Studies in the Man-System Interface in Libraries. (Report No. 2. Bethlehem, Pa.: Lehigh University, Center for the Information Sciences, 1966).

Shilling, Charles W. and Jessie Bernard. "Policies and Practices Dealing with Informal Communication as Related to Productivity and Efficiency in 64 Selected Biological Laboratories." In: Informal Communication Among Bioscientists (Part II, #16-64. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Biological Sciences Communication Project, 1964).

Appendix A

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS 1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ______________________ Date prepared ________

---

1. Present principal employment:

   Position or title: ______________________

   Department or section: ______________________

   Institution and address: ______________________

   ____

2. When did you begin work at this institution? mo./yr. ________
3. When did you begin residence in the Washington, D.C. area? mo./yr. ________
4. a. Are you currently taking any course work? Yes ______ No ______

   b. Are you working on a thesis or dissertation? Yes ______ No ______

   c. If YES to either, at what institution? ______________________

   Degree sought: ____________ Major: ______________________

   Minor(s): ______________________

5. What is the highest degree you hold? ______________________

   Institution: ______________________ Year: ________

   Major: ______________________ Minor(s): ______________________

6. Professional identification:

   a. What is your major professional area? (e.g., speech, linguistics, French, etc.)

   ____

   b. What is (are) your main subject matter interest(s) within that area? (e.g., phonetics, comparative Indo-European, TESOL, verbal learning, etc.)

   ____

   ____

7. a. Please list the professional societies and groups to which you belong, both national (e.g., Linguistic Society of America, Modern Language Association, International Reading Association, etc.) and local (e.g., Washington Linguistics Club, Greater Washington Reading Association, etc.) (Please avoid initials).

   ____________________ ____________________

   ____________________ ____________________

   ____

   b. Do you currently hold any offices in any of these organizations or are you on any of their committees? Yes ______ No ______

   If YES, please list organization(s) and position(s) held: ____________

   ____

8. What professional conventions and/or conferences have you attended in the last year? (Please list meetings and approximate dates):

   mo./yr. ____________________ mo./yr. ____________________

   mo./yr. ____________________ mo./yr. ____________________

   mo./yr. ____________________ mo./yr. ____________________

9. During the last year, have you visited any other institutions for the purpose of discussing or observing work closely related to your own? Yes ______ No ______

   If YES, approximately how many such institutions: in the D.C. area ______

   outside the D.C. area ______

10. Foreign language knowledge:

a. For purposes of research, which foreign languages can you read (with the help of a dictionary if necessary)?

__________ __________ __________ __________

b. In which foreign languages (whether you can read them or not) is there any substantial amount of material of interest to you in your work?

__________ __________ __________ __________

c. For which of the languages mentioned in the previous question would you prefer to use English translations if they were available?

__________ __________ __________ __________

11. Please rank all of the items below which are included among your professional activities, using the number 1 for the most time-consuming, 2 for the next-most time-consuming, etc. Write 0 in the blanks of those which are not included among your activities.

____ Teaching: what subject(s)? ____________________

____

____ Coursework or preparation for comprehensives

____ Dissertation or thesis research and writing: what is the topic? __________

____

____ Foreign language text or materials preparation: what language(s)? ______

____

____ Research (apart from any of the above): what is the subject? __________

____

____

____

____

____ Writing, editing (apart from materials preparation and writing up research results)

____ Administration

____ Consulting

____ Clinical work (including practicum)

____ Other (please specify): ____________________

____

12. Are any of these activities being carried out either in collaboration with a colleague, or as part of a professional team that maintains very close contact? Yes ____ No ____

If YES, please name the activities: ____________________

____

13. Now consider each of the activities you have ranked above. Which one of them puts the greatest demand on you to gather and use information related to language? (Please name the activity) If none require information related to language, write 0.

Activity: ______________________________

For this activity in general, please rate each of the media of communication listed below in terms of how important it is in furnishing information you need. Rate by circling the most appropriate number on the scale. If you do not have access to a particular source, i.e., if that source is not available to you, please check that column instead.

Source not available	Of no importance		Somewhat important		Very important	
____	1	2	3	4	5	a. Books
____	1	2	3	4	5	b. Journal articles
____	1	2	3	4	5	c. Document dissemination systems, e.g., ERIC. Please name those used: ____________
____	1	2	3	4	5	d. Technical reports, other papers not intended for publication
____	1	2	3	4	5	e. Abstract, abstract journals
____	1	2	3	4	5	f. Formal oral presentations at conventions and conferences
____	1	2	3	4	5	g. Formal lectures sponsored by local institutions or groups
____	1	2	3	4	5	h. Oral presentations at staff meetings
____	1	2	3	4	5	i. Colleagues' manuscripts, preprints intended for publication
____	1	2	3	4	5	j. Correspondence
____	1	2	3	4	5	k. Discussion with colleagues at institution of employment
____	1	2	3	4	5	l. Discussion with other colleagues in the Washington, D.C. area. If they are associated with one particular institution, please name it: ____________
____	1	2	3	4	5	m. Discussion with colleagues from outside the Washington, D.C. area. If they are associated with one particular institution, please name it: ____________

14. Consider the following general functions. Please select that medium of communication listed above which best serves each of them. Put the corresponding letter (a for books, b for journal articles, etc.) in the blank next to each. If these functions do not apply in your case, put a 0 in the blank.

General current awareness in your field ____________

Current awareness in your own chief specialty ____________

Getting up-to-date in a new area ____________

15. Now consider the activity you named in Question #13 as being most demanding of information related to language. Select that medium of communication listed above which best serves each of the specific functions listed below, where these functions are appropriate to the activity. Put the corresponding letter (a for books, b for journal articles, etc.) in the blank next to each. Where a listed function is not applicable to the activity put a 0 in the blank.

Source of ideas for new work in this activity ____________

Find out about past findings in subject of this activity ____________

Avoid duplication of work already done ____________

Learn about materials, teaching aids, apparatus, tests ____________

Learn about methodology (of teaching, research design, fieldwork, etc.) ____________

Learn about theoretical work related to this activity ____________

Obtain specific facts about the subject of this activity ____________

16. There are a number of ways of learning about the existence and or location of information in the literature of a field. For the activity you named in Question #13, which of the following do you use (please check the appropriate column). If the source is not available to you, please check that column.

Use in activity	Don't use in activity	Not available	
____	____	____	a. Regular scanning of periodical literature
____	____	____	b. Ask colleagues
____	____	____	c. Citations in books, journal articles
____	____	____	d. Ask librarians or other professional information personnel
____	____	____	e. Accidental exposure to material itself
____	____	____	f. General bibliographies (e.g., MLA Bibliography, Linguistic Bibliography, etc.) Please name those used: ____________ ____________ ____________
____	____	____	g. Subject specialty bibliographies
____	____	____	h. Research in progress services: which? ____________ ____________ ____________ ____________
____	____	____	i. Abstracts, abstract journals: Please name: ____________ ____________ ____________
____	____	____	j. Index publications: Please name: ____________ ____________
____	____	____	k. Critical reviews
____	____	____	l. State-of-the-art, summary reviews
____	____	____	m. Programs and proceedings of scientific meetings

17. Which of the sources listed immediately above have you found most helpful for this activity? (Please give letters as listed above, a for Regular scanning of literature, b for Ask colleagues, etc.): ____________

18. Suppose there were a current awareness service including coverage of language teaching, linguistics, speech, reading and other language sciences and that this service published a periodical which reproduced the tables of contents of journals with articles in these fields. The object would be to keep readers informed of the scholarly articles being published in their fields. What are ten (10) (or fewer) journals you would most like to see covered by such a publication? (Please name):

____________ ____________
____________ ____________
____________ ____________
____________ ____________
____________ ____________

19. We would be very interested in learning about any problems you have in getting information you need or suggestions you have for improving the situation with regard to the exchange of language science information. If you would like to describe these problems or suggestions, please do so on a separate sheet and return it to us along with your questionnaire. Thank you very much. [1-69]

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Person interviewed:
Date:
Institution or organization and address

I. Information on personal background and activities

1. What is the formal title of your present position?
2. What is the formal name of your immediate group here at ________?
   OR: In what department is your appointment?
   (Are you part of any formal group here working on a particular project?)
   If YES, What is the formal name of that group?
3. How long have you worked here at ________?
4. How long have you lived in the D.C. area?
5. (If answers to 3 and 4 differ): Where were you before you came to ________?
6. What is your highest degree?
   Major:
   Minor:
   School:
   Year:
7. (If degree is below Ph.D.): Are you currently working toward any other degree? (If YES): Which:
   Major:
   Minor:
   School:
   How far along are you?
8. What do you consider to be your major area?
9. Do you have a specialty within that area? What?
10. What national professional societies are you a member of?
11. Do you belong to any local societies or groups of a professional sort?
12. Do you hold any offices in any of these groups, either the national or the local, or do you serve on any of their committees?
13. Have you been involved in any special committees or task forces working on problems related to language in the last year?
14. Do you do any professional work outside ________, like consulting or teaching someplace else? What?
15. Have you attended any professional meetings -- conventions, conferences, etc. in the last year? Which and where? (with a nudge, if necessary, about the Round Table and other local meetings)

16. For purposes of research, what foreign languages can you read with the help of a dictionary, if you need it?

17. In which foreign languages is there a substantial amount of material of interest to you?

18. (Recapitulate languages): Which of these languages would you prefer to use English translations for if they were available?

19. Could you tell me something about what your duties and activities are here at ______?
(If teaching: what courses?
(If administration: of what group? What are its organizations and functions?
(If consulting: with whom? about what?
(If research, materials preparation or clinical works:
Could you tell me something about what your group is working on?
you
(Type of activity:
(Organization of group:
(General statement of problem including goals:
(Subject area:
(Types of materials or equipment used:
(Procedures:
(If it is a group project go back if necessary and ask what the person himself is doing) (If more than one problem go back)

20. How long have you been working along these lines?

21. (Recapitulate activities): About what proportion of your time would you estimate you spend on each of these activities?

II. Sources of Information

22. Do you collaborate with anyone else? Who? (If person is in a working group; if not, go on to #25): What was the most recent discussion you had about your work with someone else in the ______ group?
What did you talk about?

23. Aside from the ______ group, are there any other people here at ______ that you talk to about your work?
If YES, How long ago was your most recent discussion?
With whom?
How did you happen to be in contact with him?
Can you remember what you talked about?

24. Do you know of any other institutions or people outside of ______ that are doing work similar to yours?
If YES, which?
Have you contacted or visited any of these?
Which and how?

As these questions imply, when I ask about getting various kinds of information, I do mean to include informal discussions you would have with other people in addition to getting information from books or journals or attending conventions.

25. In doing _______ (main activity), when you look for information related to this, what specific types or classes of information are you usually after? Where do you usually go to try to find it?
26. What are your basic means of becoming aware of new projects related to your work? I mean projects which are in progress.
27. What are your best means of keeping up with current developments in your field?
28. How do you generally find out about work that has been done in the past in subjects related to what you're doing?
29. Considering all these different kinds and sources of information -- finding out about new projects, keeping up with current developments, getting information about past work, getting answers to questions: can you describe any experiences in the past year that indicated that you have been unsuccessful in getting any of these kinds of information?

III. Use of Specific Tools

30. Do you make much use of books in your work? What kinds of books have you purchased recently - on what subjects?
31. What journals do you look at regularly in connection with your work? By regularly I mean almost every issue or at least several issues a year?
32. During the last year, have you used or consulted any review literature of the summary type? Which? Would you like to see this kind of thing in your area?
33. Have you used any technical report literature in the last year -- by that I mean unpublished reports written in connection with various projects. If YES, how do you get hold of these reports? Do you have problems finding out what's available or getting access to it?
34. Have you used or consulted any bibliographies in the last year? Which? How about abstracts? How about ERIC?
35. What libraries or information centers have you used in the past year. What did you use them for?
36. In addition to what you've already mentioned, do you have any other problems or frustrations in getting information you need or suggestions for improving things as they are now? What are they?

Appendix C

Additional Question Sent to Questionnaire Respondents

NAME: ______________________________

Please rate each of the following areas of research or scholarship in terms of its importance as a source of the information you require. Rate by circling the most appropriate number of the scale.

Of no importance		**Somewhat important**		**Very important**	
1	2	3	4	5	**a. Education**
1	2	3	4	5	**b. Language teaching methodology**
1	2	3	4	5	**c. Psychology**
1	2	3	4	5	**d. Mathematics**
1	2	3	4	5	**e. Philosophy**
1	2	3	4	5	**f. English**
1	2	3	4	5	**g. English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)**
1	2	3	4	5	**h. Linguistics**
1	2	3	4	5	**i. Speech pathology**
1	2	3	4	5	**j. Anthropology**
1	2	3	4	5	**k. Sociology**
1	2	3	4	5	**l. Acoustics**
1	2	3	4	5	**m. Medicine**
1	2	3	4	5	**n. Computer programming**
1	2	3	4	5	**o. Other aspects of computer technology**

Of no importance		Somewhat important		Very important		
1	2	3	4	5	p.	Other engineering-related technologies (Please name area of greatest interest.)
1	2	3	4	5	q.	Scholarship of a particular language or language family (Please name language or language family in which you have the greatest interest.)

THANK YOU.

Appendix D

Journals for which Current Awareness Coverage is Desired by Foreign Language Specialists

Total responding: 52

Foreign Language and Philology Journals

AATSEEL Journal	2
Acta Orientalia	1
American Journal of Archaeology	1
American Journal of Philology	1
Anales Cervantinos	1
Archivio Glottologico Italiano	1
Archiv Orientalni	1
Audio-visual Language Journal	1
Babel	1
Bahasa dan Budaja	1
Boletin de Filología, Instituto de Filología de la Universidad de Chile	1
Bulletin Hispanique. Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux	2
Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris	1
Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies	1
Cahiers Raciniens	1
Chung-kuo yü-wen	6
Chugokugogaku	1
Classical Bulletin	1
Classical Journal	4
Classical Outlook	3
Classical World	3
Comparative Literature Studies	4
Convergences	1
English for Immigrants	1

Foreign Language and Philology Journals

The English Language Teacher	1
English Language Teaching	4
English Teaching Forum	3
Englisch an Volkshochschulen	1
Foreign Language Annals	4
Français Moderne	1
French Review	9
Germanische-Romanische Monatsschrift	1
German Quarterly	4
Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana	1
Hispania	7
Hispanic Review	1
The Incorporated Linguist	1
International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics	1
L'Interprète	2
Journal of Chinese Language Teachers Association	1
Journal of English as a Second Language	1
Language Learning	8
Lebende Sprachen	1
Linguist	2
Linguistica	1
Literaturnaja Gazeta	1
Luso-Brazilian Review	1
Mercure de France	1
Meta	1
Modern Language Journal	8
Mundo Hispánico	1
Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages	2
Novyi Mir	1
Nueva Revista de Filología	1
Los Pappelos de San Armadans	1

Foreign Language and Philology Journals

PMLA	10
Publications of the Educational Testing Service	1
Publications of the Faculté des Lettres, Université de Strasbourg	1
Revista de Filologia Espanola	1
Revista de Letras	1
Revista de Literatura	1
Revista de Occidente	1
Revista Portuguesa de Filología	1
Revista de Trateo	1
Revue de la Linguistique Romane	1
Revue des Cours et Conférences	1
Revue des Deux Mondes	2
Romance Philology	3
Romania	1
Romanic Philology	1
Romanic Review	2
Russian Language Journal	1
Russian Review	1
Russkaja rech	1
Russkij Jazyk za Rubiežom	2
Segismundo	1
Slavic and East European Journal	2
Slavic Review	1
Speculum	1
TEFL. A Bulletin for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language	1
TESOL Newsletter	2
TESOL Quarterly	7
T'oung Pao	1
Traduire	1
United Nations' Terminology Publications	1
Die Unterrichtspraxis	1

Voprosy Jazykoznanija	1
Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie	1

Linguistics Journals

American Speech	1
Foundations of Language	1
Georgetown Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics	3
International Journal of American Linguistics	3
International Review of Applied Linguistics	3
Journal of Applied Linguistics	1
Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association	1
Journal of Linguistics	1
Language	9
Lingua	1
Studies in Linguistics	2
Voprosy Jazykoznanija	1
Word	5

Specific Foreign Language Journals

African Language Studies. Collected Papers in Oriental and African Studies	1
Celtica	1
Celtic Review	1
Éigse	1
English Language Teaching	4
English Language Teaching Abstracts	1
Ériu	1
Etudes celtiques	1
Le Français dan le Monde	2
French Review	3
Hispania	4
Indogermanische Forschungen	1
L'Italia Dialettale	1

Italica	2
Journal of African Languages	3
Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association	1

Specific Foreign Language Journals

Journal of West African Languages	2
Oceanic Linguistics	2
Revue des etudes arméniennes	1
Scottish Gaelic Studies	1
Slavic and East European Journal	1
Studia Celtica	1
Studie Hibernica	1
Studia Neophilologica	1
TEFL. A Bulletin for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language	1
TESOL Quarterly	4
Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie	1

Unspecified Foreign Language Journals

Babel	1
Florida Foreign Language Reporter	2
Foreign Language Annals	6
Language Learning	15
Language Teaching Abstracts	3
Lochlann	1
Modern Language Journal	8
PMLA	4

Journals in Other Fields

American Anthropologist	1
Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities	1
Harvard Educational Review	1
Journal of the American Oriental Society	1
NEA Journal	1
Revue de la Documentation	1